232.5Q
T393

THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL
SEMINARY LIBRARY
CHELSEA SQUARE, NEW YORK 11, N. Y.

sigillum seminarii theologici generalis ecclesiae protestantis episcopalis in civitatibus foederatis
sermo tuus veritas est
A
Ω

Dean Hoffman Fund

THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVES AND MODERN CRITICISM

THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVES AND MODERN CRITICISM

A *CRITIQUE* MAINLY OF PROFESSOR SCHMIEDEL'S ARTICLE "RESURRECTION NARRATIVES" IN THE *ENCYCLOPÆDIA BIBLICA*

BY

THOMAS JAMES THORBURN, D.D., LL.D.

CHRIST'S COLLEGE
LIBRARY
NEW ZEALAND

LONDON
KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER & CO., LTD.
DRYDEN HOUSE, 43 GERRARD STREET, W.
1910

232.5Q
T 393

52106

UNION THEOL. SEMINARY
LIBRARY
NEW YORK

VXORI · CARISSIMAE ·
CONSORTI · VITAE · STVDIORVM · AVCTORI ·
HOC · OPVS · AMANTER ·
DEDICATVR .

Εἰ δὲ Χριστὸς οὐκ ἐγήγερται, κενὸν ἄρα τὸ κήρυγμα ἡμῶν, κενὴ δὲ καὶ ἡ πίστις ὑμῶν. Εὑρισκόμεθα δὲ καὶ ψευδομάρτυρες τοῦ Θεοῦ· ὅτι ἐμαρτυρήσαμεν κατὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ ὅτι ἤγειρε τὸν Χριστόν . . .

Paul. ad Corinth., A. xv. 14, 15

PREFACE

If any apology be needed for the addition of another book to the already extensive list of works dealing with the Story of the Resurrection from the Dead of our Lord Jesus Christ, it is to be found in the overwhelming importance of the subject itself. A further justification will, perhaps, be the need, which the present writer believes still exists, for a thorough examination and discussion of the ingenious and fascinating theory of Subjective Hallucinations propounded by Professor Schmiedel in the pages of the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, and based upon the earlier Vision theory of Strauss and Renan, by means of which he would explain that momentous event.

It may here be premised that the writer of this Essay has no antiquated prejudice whatever against the application of a system of sound criticism to any of the narratives contained in the Gospels, or others of the various books which make up our present Bible. On the contrary, he thoroughly believes that such criticism is not only permissible, but even absolutely necessary, if we are ever to arrive at an intelligent and satisfactory knowledge of these matters. While their explanation and acceptance are not merely a matter of critical enquiry, criticism of the right kind is a very important factor in any

belief, or assent, which we may be called upon to give to them.

But there is criticism *and* criticism; and it is very evident that our arrival at sound and satisfactory conclusions must depend both upon the spirit in which we enter upon the search for truth, and the rules which we lay down beforehand for our guidance during that search. And it is precisely here—as regards the latter condition—that the writer would join issue with much that passes for sound and helpful criticism at the present time. Indeed, it is becoming more evident every day, that the preliminary rules often laid down for the enquiry stand greatly in need of more careful consideration, and, in some cases, of revision.

For example, we frequently find the following general assumptions tacitly adopted, if not expressly laid down, as canons for the examination of ancient religious documents :—

1. The impossibility, and, therefore, the utter unreality of the (so-called) "supernatural."

Starting with what the present writer believes to be a radically wrong definition of a "miracle," there is often, throughout the whole enquiry, an undercurrent of entire disbelief in the truth of any event related, which cannot be wholly explained in terms of the modern scientific views of "matter" and "force," or "energy."

Now, considering how exceedingly meagre our present knowledge of the Universe, and its con-

stitution and laws, is, and how little we still know of the Mystery which it enshrines, this *à priori* presumption is most unwarrantable and misleading. It often amounts, indeed, to a simple *petitio principii* (as the logicians say)—a begging of the very question which is at issue.

Moreover, *if* there be no "supernatural," what need for any discussion of such matters at all?

Why this waste of ink and paper, not to speak of time and trouble? In such a case we admit the necessary inference at once; *quæstio cadit*, and religion is an empty dream.

But since objectors of this sort, for the most part, base their opposition to the "supernatural" upon the grounds of its *impossibility*—and, indeed, no other really valid objection can be raised—they may, perhaps, with advantage be reminded of the very significant words of the late Professor Huxley, no mean authority from their point of view:—"Strictly speaking," he says (*Science and Christian Tradition*, p. 197), "I am unaware of anything that has a right to the title of an 'impossibility,' except a contradiction in terms."

We cannot, therefore (such being the case), either scientifically or logically, rule out *à priori* the "supernatural" upon the grounds that we know it is impossible, and non-existent. We know nothing of the kind.

2. Another and fruitful source of misconception and erroneous deduction is, the writer believes, the

assumption, often tacitly made, that ancient Oriental writers invariably recorded events, and presented the evidence for their statements, exactly as modern and European authors, writing under totally different conditions, and possessing entirely different temperaments and outlook, would do. And it is further assumed that these ancient writers must be judged by precisely the same standards as their modern representatives.

But this—it has frequently been shown—is by no means the case. The motives and methods and ideas of, *e.g.*, a biographer living in the first century A.D., as a rule, differ *toto cælo* from those of a modern writer. And, if we try to judge the one by the standards of the other, we make an initial and fundamental mistake, which will vitiate all our results.

As a particular instance of one effect of the above-named assumption, to which exception is here taken, we may mention the exaggerated application of the *Argumentum e silentio*—a most dangerous principle, even when applied to the works of a contemporary modern author.

This application commonly takes the form of endeavouring to prove from the basis of an assumed (and often arbitrary) chronological arrangement of certain undated documents, that some alleged fact (or facts) recorded in the later, but omitted in the earlier accounts was (were) unknown to the writers of the latter.

For example: St Paul, writing about the year

55 A.D., does not expressly mention the Empty Tomb; Mark and Matthew, writing from ten to twenty years afterwards, do; *therefore*, argues this type of critic, Paul knew nothing of it; and *therefore*, again, it was a legend which had grown-up subsequently to the earlier date.

But this method of criticism is practically nothing else than making our own ignorance the measure of a writer's reasons for such omission.

It is, in fact, to adopt the purely *subjective* mode of criticism—admittedly a most untrustworthy method—in an extreme form. We cannot draw a definite conclusion from mere omission in any such hasty manner; and the mere negative "argument from silence" requires a very cautious and provisional application in every case.

3. Lastly, the author would here raise a protest against the unscientific way in which *evidence* of various kinds is viewed and appraised by many modern theologians. That is to say, there is little or no distinction made between the discrepancies which are found in statements of matters that are essential and important, and those met with in the records of matters relatively non-essential and unimportant.

But this is equally bad criticism and bad law. For, it is one thing for several witnesses, testifying to the same event, to differ fundamentally in their statements concerning it, and quite another thing for them to differ on points of minor and unimportant

detail. The former fact would invalidate the whole of their testimony; the latter fact does not. On the contrary, it tends rather (under certain conditions) to strengthen it, as the writer has tried to show in the present work.

It is high time, therefore, that some clear and definite understanding were arrived at, as to the application and use of these and other rules, whether stated explicitly, or introduced by implication, in the case of subjects to which criticism is applied. For, until there is something like a general unanimity with regard to them, much of the criticism of the present day must remain inconclusive, and even futile.

In going through the Resurrection Narratives, the writer has carefully examined Professor Schmiedel's treatment of each recorded Appearance, and he has pointed out in every case where and why he dissents from the conclusions arrived at in that celebrated Article.

That there are difficulties in connection with the Narratives he is well aware. But these difficulties, he believes, arise chiefly from the very fragmentary and brief form in which the accounts have reached us. Judged as a whole, and taken on the main issues, he feels no doubt as to the general conclusion to which the evidence points. That this evidence (in the modern sense of the term) does not reach the standard demanded by some people, he is also conscious. But he would remind such exacting

persons, that evidence of the kind they ask for can seldom or never be obtained for *any* historic event. And, furthermore, that there is—in addition to *intellectual* evidence—such a thing as *moral* evidence, as Kant himself reminds us in both of his famous Critiques. And, finally, he would add (as Kant also taught), that each of these kinds of evidence supplements and makes up for the deficiencies which must—in every case—inevitably exist in the other, so long as we live in a world that is imperfect, and ourselves share in that imperfection.

CONTENTS

CHAP.		PAGE
	PREFACE	ix
	ARGUMENT	xix
I.	THE APPEARANCE(S) TO THE *WOMEN* NEAR THE SEPULCHRE	1
II.	THE APPEARANCE(S) TO THE *WOMEN* (*continued*)	18
III.	THE APPEARANCES TO (1) *PETER*, (2) *JAMES*, AND (3) THE *TWO DISCIPLES* NEAR EMMAUS	27
IV.	THE APPEARANCES TO THE *ELEVEN* AND THE *FIVE HUNDRED*	45
V.	THE APPEARANCE TO THE *SEVEN* ON THE SHORE OF THE LAKE OF GALILEE	60
VI.	THE VISION OF *PAUL* ON THE DAMASCUS ROAD	69
VII.	ST PAUL'S LIST OF APPEARANCES, AND THE GOSPEL RECORDS	86
VIII.	THE EMPTY TOMB	97
IX.	THE SCENE OF THE FIRST APPEARANCES	111
X.	THE NATURE OF THE APPEARANCES	128
XI.	THE NATURE OF THE APPEARANCES (*continued*)	141
XII.	SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION	155

APPENDICES

PAGE

A. Extra-Canonical Resurrection Narratives . . 168

B. The Watch at the Sepulchre . . . 179

C. Critical Theories of the Resurrection . . 183

1. *The Swoon Theory* 183
2. *The Vision Theory* 185
3. *The Apparition Theory* 188
4. *The "Telegram" Theory* 189
5. *Theories of Fraud.*
   - (*a*) Theft of the Body by the Disciples . 191
   - (*b*) Conspiracy Theory 192
6. *Theory of Roman Interference* . . . 197
7. *Mythological Theory* 199

D. Jewish Doctrine concerning the Resurrection of the Dead, and the Teaching of the New Testament 209

Index 213

ARGUMENT

CHAPS. I.-V. deal with the phenomena of the various recorded Appearances to the women and disciples, discuss the alleged 'discrepancies,' and examine the common objections raised in the case of each.

CHAP. VI. examines the three Narratives in the Acts relative to the conversion of St Paul and the alleged 'discrepancies' between them; also the alleged 'discrepancies' between the Accounts in the Acts and the Pauline Epistles, and the question of the *Subjective* or *Objective* nature of the vision.

CHAP. VII. deals with the Pauline List of the Appearances, discusses the question of its *completeness*, and the reasons for its not including all those recorded in the Gospels.

CHAP. VIII. discusses the question of St Paul's silence as to the empty tomb; the reason for St Paul's not quoting the evidence of the women. Shows that St Paul in dealing with the general Resurrection does not teach the doctrine of a mere re-animation of the body, but that of an exchange of the "Natural Body" (*σῶμα ψυχικόν*) for the "Spiritual Body" (*σῶμα πνευματικόν*). Further, that the empty tomb was not a post-Pauline legend; also that the demand for an examination of the tomb by prejudiced opponents is absurd.

CHAP. IX. examines the three theories as to the *Scene* of the First Appearances:—

(1) Galilee, (2) Jerusalem, (3) Jerusalem-Galilee, and states the difficulties peculiar to each.

CHAP. X.—The two Vision-theories discussed in this Chapter are (1) *The Subjective*, and (2) The *Objective*. The former (Schmiedel's theory) admits the historical character of the *visual* experiences of the disciples, but denies the historicity of the recorded *auditory* and *tactual* phenomena. But it is shown that there is no ground for this distinction (*a*) in the text of the Narratives themselves, and (*b*) because persons subject to hallucinatory *visions* are liable to *auditory* and *tactual* hallucinations also. Consequently no such distinction can be insisted on, and the *Subjective Vision* theory breaks down both historically and psychologically.

The latter (Keim's theory) is, *inter alia*, open to the objection that it does not explain the recorded phenomena. The *real Objective presence* of

Jesus was testified to by a consensus of the three forms of sense-perception in various numbers of persons of average soundness of mind, etc. If we deny the validity of this witness, we must fall back either upon a theory of mere *subjective vision*—as previously—or else one of general hallucination as regards *all* our sense-experiences. But this would tend to reduce everything to unreality.

Chap. XI. treats of the three other theories which admit of an Appearance of some kind. (1) *Revivified Body*, (2) *Pure*, or "*Materialized*" *Spirit*, and (3) *A Spiritual Body*.

(1) This theory, it is shown, does not harmonize with the various facts recorded in the Narratives, *e.g.* the sudden disappearances of Jesus, etc. (2) Here the evidence shows that the Appearances were not in any way caused by, or connected with, ancient magical or spiritualistic practices on the part of the disciples. (3) This (the Pauline theory of the Resurrection body), it is maintained, alone satisfies the phenomena as recorded in the Narratives. Prof. Schmiedel objects to it as involving a 'miracle,' because all the 'stages' of the genesis of such a body cannot be represented in thought. But neither can we represent to ourselves all the 'stages' in the origin and genesis of *thought* itself; the formation, *e.g.* of a *percept* (and still more of a *concept*) is really inexplicable. This is, therefore, in itself no valid objection, or reason for a summary rejection.

Chap. XII. sums up the argument. Prof. Schmiedel's objections are, in general, reducible to two :—

(1) That the Appearances were merely *Subjective* in their nature.

(2) That the internal 'discrepancies' in the Narratives invalidate their statements.

(1) Has been shown, it is believed, to be inadmissible, since all the Appearances recorded in the New Testament contain *auditory* as well as *visual* experiences. The *tactual* experiences are also equally well authenticated historically, and equally possible in any subjective hallucination. But the collective evidence of these three forms of sense-perception acting in concert is universally accepted as a sufficient test of the *actual objective reality* of a phenomenon, when the experiences are shared by a number of persons. (2) The discrepancies (greatly exaggerated by the negative critic) are comparatively but few in number and concern only unimportant details. And the divergence in minor details of witnesses is regarded in point of law as strengthening rather than weakening a case, since it shows absence of collusion on the part of the witnesses.

Finally, the *fact* of the Resurrection, as a *real Objective Phenomenon* of some order, is, it is maintained, indisputable, and has not been refuted, or explained away by modern negative criticism.

THE RESURRECTION NARRATIVES AND MODERN CRITICISM

CHAPTER I

THE APPEARANCE(S) TO THE *WOMEN* NEAR THE SEPULCHRE

Matt. xxviii. 1-10; [Mark xvi. 9-11]; Luke xxiv. 1-11; John xx. 1-2, 11-18

All our Gospels commence their Narratives of the Resurrection with an account of a visit of certain women to the Sepulchre. Their object in coming is stated by Mark and Luke to be that of 'anointing' the body of Jesus; though, according to the Fourth Gospel, this had already been done—at least partially—by Joseph of Arimathæa and Nicodemus during the late afternoon of the day of Crucifixion. Matthew simply says that the women came to 'see' the sepulchre, thus passing over (though not of necessity either denying or being ignorant of) their purpose as stated by the two other Synoptists.

According to Mark the only difficulty which the women foresaw to the carrying out of their design, was the rolling away of the great stone[1] which

[1] A gloss in Cod. Bez. adds, "And when he was laid there, he (Joseph) put against the tomb a stone which twenty men could not roll away."

closed the entrance to the tomb; the difficulty arising from the presence of a guard (mentioned only by Matthew), charged with the duty of keeping off intruders, was evidently not anticipated by them. This is quite probable, though not necessarily for the reason assumed by Prof. Schmiedel—that there never was a guard there. Whether the episode of the guard be historical or not, is discussed elsewhere;[1] but if any such arrangement were made it would undoubtedly be a private one, and the Watch itself would not be posted before the evening of the *second* day;[2] and the women in that case would not know about it when they set out.

As regards the names of these women there is some little variation in the several accounts: Matthew gives them as Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of James ('the other Mary'); Mark gives Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of James, and Salome; Luke, Mary Magdalene, Mary, the mother of James, Joanna, and 'other women'; John, on the other hand, mentions by name only Mary Magdalene.

It will be seen, therefore, that the position of prominence in all four lists is given to Mary Magdalene, and that Mary, the mother of James, is mentioned in all three Synoptics. As regards Salome, she may perhaps be included among the unnamed women of Luke; and the fact that Matthew does not mention

[1] Appendix B.

[2] Cp. Matt. xxviii. 63. The idea would doubtless be to catch the disciples *flagrante delicto*, assuming that the Pharisees had heard of and disbelieved the prediction.

any others does not, of necessity, exclude her from being present along with those whom he mentions by name.

In the case of John, however, the variation at this point is apparently greater; he not only does not mention any purpose in their visit, but says (xix. 35-40) that Joseph and Nicodemus had embalmed the body before laying it in the tomb; while Matthew (xxvii. 59 ff.) and Luke (xxiv. 53) state that Joseph alone had merely wrapped it in a fine linen cloth. This variation in detail is made somewhat much of by Prof. Schmiedel, but does not seem of great importance. The ordinary explanation that the 'anointing' of Joseph and Nicodemus (ver. 40) was a hurried and merely temporary process is very probable. A course of thorough embalmment, which would have taken many hours, at least, could not have been carried out on the Friday before sunset; and, in any case, the women were not likely to know of Joseph's action, since it would probably be arranged privately, and carried out inside the tomb.

We have already noticed that Mary Magdalene is alone mentioned by John, and Prof. Schmiedel argues that the writer thereby affirms that she came *alone*, *i.e.* without the other women mentioned in the Synoptics. His argument is based upon the use of the sing. verb ἔρχεται ('she comes') in ver. 1, the same verb being repeated in ver. 2. In the latter, however, it is added that she then ran back to Simon Peter and 'the other disciple' (John),

and said, 'we know not (οὐκ οἴδαμεν) where they have laid him.' "This pl. 'we,'" Prof. Schmiedel urges, "can only be intended to express Mary Magdalene's thought that *other Christians*,[1] in whom some knowledge of the facts might be presumed, did not actually possess it,"—adding, however,—"if it is not an unconscious reminiscence of the 'women' of the Synoptics."

The meaning which he would give here to the pl. '*we*' is a very strained and unnatural one; she would hardly speak for 'other Christians' (? disciples), who had not been present at all; and if he means any of the Eleven, these, he declares elsewhere, had all fled to Galilee long before this.[2] Moreover, there seems to be no indication in the narrative that any other disciples knew of the location of the tomb, or that the body of Jesus had been laid there.[3] Her further remark, '*I* know not' is made some time after to one of the angels, and since it is stated (xx. 10) that Peter and John had then left her and *implied* that she was now alone, she naturally drops the 'we,' and says '*I* know not'; but this does not affect the force of the previous 'we,' which can only be taken naturally to mean herself and some other women.

It may also be noted here that Prof. Schmiedel urges the want of textual support elsewhere for the visit of the two disciples. A visit of Peter alone

[1] The italics are ours. [2] See pp. 116, 117.
[3] Matt. xxvii. 61; Mark xv. 47; Luke xxiv. 55.

(on the report of the women) is certainly recorded in Luke xxiv. 12; but this verse is not found in the Western Group of MSS., and is bracketed by Westcott and Hort as probably a later interpolation.[1] Prof. Schmiedel, however, thinks it cannot have been copied from John xx. 3-8, "because the mention of Peter alone does not harmonize with the 'some' (τινές) of ver. 24, and 'them' (αὐτῶν) of ver. 13 connects with ver. 11, not with ver. 12."

This conclusion may probably be allowed. A further adverse argument would be that xxiv. 12 is more or less inconsistent with the statement in ver. 11. This admission, however, does not necessarily make the incident unhistorical; it would indeed seem to be the most natural thing for some at least of the disciples to do, if they were in Jerusalem at the time.

Another 'discrepancy,' which is somewhat pressed by Prof. Schmiedel, is the *time* of the visit. This, we find, is variously stated in the several accounts as 'late on the sabbath' (Matt.); 'when the sun was risen' (Mark); 'at early dawn' (Luke); 'early, when it was yet dark' (John). These divergencies he regards as serious differences, so we will examine them in some detail.

The words 'late on the Sabbath' (ὀψὲ σαββάτων) form an obscure Hebraism, which, if used in an accurate and precise sense, and with strict reference

[1] So too other chief editors. Tischendorf omits it altogether; Lachmann and Tregelles mark it as questionable. But see ver. 24, which seems to corroborate the statement in 12, that an examination of the tomb *was* made by some of the disciples.

to the Jewish mode of reckoning time would mean the time about *sunset* on the Sabbath evening. But it is very doubtful whether either of these conditions obtains here. It is probable that the writer of the narrative had not an accurate acquaintance with the niceties of Greek phraseology, and, further, did not adhere strictly to the Jewish mode of computing time.[1] The words which immediately follow these—'as the light shone forth towards the first day of the week' (*τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ εἰς μίαν σαββάτων*)—show clearly that the time about sunset cannot be meant.[2] It is, therefore, improbable that there is any greater variation here than what is due to the somewhat vague and inaccurate phraseology of the writer. The statements of the other narratives are practically identical, all placing the visit of the women just about—or shortly after (Mark)—daybreak, the Fourth Gospel inclining rather towards the hour just preceding it.

Consequently, it is evident, both from a consideration of Matthew's explanatory phrase, and from a comparison with the other three narratives, that the time *about dawn* is really meant by all four writers. And so, to make Matthew diverge from them 'to

[1] He deviates from it in xxvii. 45, 46.

[2] Schmiedel's attempt to explain the words by reference to Luke xxiii. 54, 'the sabbath shone forth,' which he thinks refers to the rekindling of the lights after the sabbath was past, cannot be accepted. Keim (*Jesus of Nazara*, iii. p. 522, E. Tr.) shows that the same phrase was used of the other days of the week; and therefore Matthew cannot be referring here to the artificial light. Neither can the 'by night' (*νυκτός*) of ver. 13 have any reference to the time of the women's visit; as the implication of Matthew is that the soldiers meant that the body had been already stolen earlier in the night.

the extent of half a day,' is to read a meaning into his words which they cannot be fairly said to contain.

Neither can we attach much importance to the small variation in the matter of the purchase of the spices, to which Prof. Schmiedel also refers: Luke states that they were bought on the Friday before sunset, while Mark says that they were procured on the evening following the Sabbath. The real explanation here—as frequently elsewhere—is that no exact notes were made at the time of so simple and unimportant a matter, and consequently such a trifling deviation in a story told some time after by different people, speaking from memory, is only what might be expected.[1]

But we now come to differences in the narrative which are more striking. On arriving at the tomb, according to the version of Matthew, the stone was rolled away in their presence by an angel who descended amidst 'a great earthquake.' The words here, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐγένετο ('and behold there took place') would naturally seem to mean that the women witnessed this occurrence, and the shock

[1] Dr Plummer (St Luke, *Inter. Crit. Comms.*) thinks that Luke probably got his information about the visit to the tomb from Joanna. Dean Alford suggests one of the disciples who went to Emmaus, "who had evidently an imperfect knowledge of what had happened before they left the city." The Johannine account would seem to be not improbably derived (ultimately) from the Magdalene herself, since it gives her experiences in great detail. Matthew and Mark *may* have got theirs (ultimately) from 'the other Mary'—or Salome. The fragmentary character of all the Narratives, and the way in which they differ in matters of detail suggest very strongly a derivation from the accounts of several persons who—especially since they were frightened and confused—would vary somewhat in their versions of the affair.

of the descent, which rolled away the stone, is described as an 'earthquake' (σεισμός), as is shown by the use of the γάρ ('for'). The implication, however, is that the Resurrection had already taken place, since the opening of the tomb would be unnecessary for the egress of Jesus.

In Mark, the women are stated to have found it rolled away; this is a real discrepancy; but can easily be accounted for by the confusion and fright into which it is stated the women were thrown.[1]

A further difference, again, occurs in what they saw there: Matthew and Mark say *one* angel ('sitting *outside* upon the stone' [Matt.]; '*inside* the tomb' [Mark]); Luke says they saw 'two men (ἄνδρες) in shining garments.' John would seem to imply that at first no one was seen, and that Mary Magdalene at once went away (leaving the other women there?) to speak to the disciples; and coming back shortly after (by which time the other women seem to have left), and looking into the tomb, she saw 'two angels' there. This is evidently a very confused account which we cannot now harmonize in detail. The

[1] Cp. Luke xxiv. 36; John xx. 19, 26. Also account in *Gospel acc. to Peter* (Appendix C), which states the matter differently. Viewed in the light of the statements of the above-named Evangelists, and also of St Paul's exposition of Christian doctrine, regarding the nature of the resurrection body (Appendix F), we must regard the removal of the stone as unnecessary. The author of *Supernatural Religion* declares this a defect in the evidence (*Sup. Rel.* iii. p. 449), and complains that "there was not a single eye-witness of the resurrection. The empty grave, coupled with the supposed subsequent appearances of Jesus is the only evidence." Schmiedel, however, appears to approve of this reticence as to details and manner, which is shown in all the Canonical literature.

Narratives, however, agree absolutely in *four* general statements :—

(1) Certain women went to the tomb, (2) the stone was rolled away in some supernormal manner (not stated but perhaps implied in John), (3) certain supernatural beings (being) were (was) seen there (the ἄνδρες of Luke probably does not mean ordinary men [cp. Acts i. 10]), (4) the body was gone in some inexplicable manner.

We have now come to what is perhaps the most difficult question in the whole narrative. Are we to understand that there were *two* Appearances near the tomb, or only *one*? It seems possible—allowing for the omission of minor details—to infer that there were two, and the usual "harmony" of the Narratives adopts this view. On this supposition, Mary Magdalene and the other women came together to the tomb, and witnessed its opening, but at first saw no one. Mary Magdalene then ran back to report to the disciples, and meanwhile the other women saw the angel (or angels), either inside, or outside, of the tomb, who announced that Jesus had risen. These women then leaving in mingled joy and consternation met Jesus a short distance away. Shortly after their departure, Peter and John arrived, followed by Mary Magdalene. The two former looked into the tomb, saw nothing but the linen bands and the napkin, and then went away. Lastly Mary Magdalene looked into the tomb, saw the two angels, who asked her why she wept, and then

turning round she saw Jesus Himself, whom at first she did not recognize.

Another view of the Narratives—adopted mainly by the negative critic—is that they are a confused account of one Appearance only.[1]

This is a difficult point to decide: the Narratives are all so fragmentary and incomplete that the greatest care is necessary in trying to fit them together.[2] The evidence of the Fourth Gospel favours the former alternative, since the writer distinctly says that Mary Magdalene made *two* visits to the tomb. If this latter be an accurate record, then it would seem that the Synoptists must have omitted to record her departure to inform the disciples, Matthew only recording an Appearance to the other women after she had left them.[3]

We now come to a matter in which, as Prof. Schmiedel allows, there is complete unanimity in the Synoptic Narratives, but which is not touched upon in the Fourth Gospel. All three Synoptics give the announcement of the angels—'He is risen; he is not here,' in practically identical words. To this Matthew and Mark add, 'Fear ye not . . . ye seek

[1] It must be borne in mind, however, that the negative critic usually considers the visit to the tomb unhistorical. Renan, on the other hand, apparently allows some kind of (imaginary) Appearance to Mary Magdalene, perhaps near the tomb: "Let us say, however, that the strong imagination of Mary Magdalene played an important part in this circumstance" (*Life of Jesus*, p. 296). See also Steck's view (p. 86, note).

[2] All attempts at harmonization of the Narratives are foredoomed to failure. This fact was noted long ago by Dean Alford (*Greek Test.* vol. i. p. 286, 4th Ed.), who deprecates such attempts.

[3] Matt. xxviii. 9, 10.

the Crucified One.' In John the angels merely ask, 'Why weepest thou?' The omission here of the announcement is remarkable; but this account follows Luke in omitting the charge to the disciples to proceed to Galilee. It would no doubt be possible to devise some explanation—more or less plausible—for these omissions; but probably the real reason, once more, is the fact that we have to do with fragmentary accounts, which are, moreover, each written from some personal standpoint. Each Evangelist really presents his record in almost absolute independence of the others, though in many places the accounts of necessity coincide even in minute details.[1]

Again, the discrepancies in the instructions given to the women by the angels are, according to Prof. Schmiedel, "the most violent in the whole account." In the report of the Synoptists, the women are reminded that Jesus while in Galilee had foretold His death and subsequent Resurrection—Luke adding 'on the *third* day.'[2] Matthew and Mark add the injunction to go and tell the disciples (Mark specially names Peter) that He would meet them there, while Luke merely refers to His prediction that He would rise again: in John there is no reminder of the prophecy, and no injunction to go to Galilee. It will be seen, therefore, that whilst there is considerable difference in the accounts at this point, the term 'violent,' as applied to the divergencies (mostly

[1] *I.e.* they use common sources of information, but do not copy them *verbatim*.

[2] Cp. Matt. xvi. 21, 23; Mark viii. 31, ix. 31; Luke ix. 22.

in matters of *omission* by one or other), is altogether too strong. There is also much underlying unanimity and no manifest contradiction. Matthew and Mark both send the disciples to Galilee, where they are to see Jesus—though it is not stated, or even obviously implied, that they will *first* see Him there.[1] Luke is silent about the Galilean Appearances (though he must have known of them, if the Galilean tradition were so ancient and so well established), and, therefore, consistently omits to send them thither. These omissions are just as probably due to the fact that Luke knew they had been already twice recorded when he wrote, as that he was either unaware of them, or disbelieved the tradition of Appearances in Galilee. Indeed, both these latter reasons are highly improbable for the reason—amongst others—that Luke came into close relations with several of the Apostles, who are supposed to have held to the tradition of Galilee. John also is silent upon the subject, and the Galilean Appearances are only referred to by that Gospel in the Appendix (chap. xxi.).

Again, Prof. Schmiedel pronounces the differences in the reported *action* of the women as 'no less marked.' According to Matthew (xxviii. 8) "they *intend* to convey the message, and ver. 16 leaves it to be inferred that they carried out their intention; according to Mark (xvi. 8) the women out of fear

[1] Prof. Schmiedel argues from this assumption, which is quite unwarranted.

say nothing to anyone." Luke, however, states (xxiv. 10, 11) that they went and told these things unto the Apostles, adding that, 'their words seemed to them as idle tales,[1] and they believed them not.'

This point of the delivery of the angelic message is one of very great importance, since it practically forms the basis of the whole of Prof. Schmiedel's theory of the empty tomb.[2] It will be necessary, therefore, to examine this question more closely.

It is well known to all students of the New Testament, that it is almost practically certain that the end of Mark's Gospel (xvi. 9-20) is a later addition, intended by the scribe who added it to replace the original ending, which is unfortunately lost. The original Gospel, therefore, now breaks off abruptly with the last words of ver. 8, 'neither said they anything to anyone,' adding as the reason, 'for they were afraid' (ἐφοβοῦντο γάρ).

Now, the question arises, what did the *original* ending of the Gospel say further about this, for it is evident that it must have said something? The question is, as we have said, of great importance; for Prof. Schmiedel would argue therefrom that the disciples *were never told that the tomb was empty* (they were as a matter of fact in Galilee at the time), and, consequently, the whole story of the tomb is a later

[1] Greek λῆρος, 'babble.' A Greek medical term used of the incoherent talk of delirium. This expression tells forcibly against the theory that the disciples were just then mentally predisposed to comfortable illusions.

[2] See chap. vi.

invention, originating perhaps some twenty years, or more, after the event.

This latter point is dealt with more particularly elsewhere (chap. vi.), so we will confine our remarks here to the question of the delivery of the message.

It would seem, on the face of it, improbable that any women, if they had the experiences detailed here, did not relate them afterwards. If they did not, whence arose the germ of the tradition (true or false) of the empty tomb? Further, there are strong reasons for believing that the *original* narrative did not so end, or rather, that its ending did not convey this meaning. The question is discussed by Mr J. F. Blair as follows:[1]—"Mark's statement that the women 'said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid,'" he writes, "does not necessarily mean that they held their peace even from good. They were instructed, according to Mark, to tell the disciples and Peter (ver. 7). Their fear would dispose them to deliver their message as quickly as possible, and would only prevent them from spreading the report among the unbelieving Jews. If they said nothing to anyone, the inference seems incontestable that they did not say anything to the disciples; but *absolute silence* is a psychological improbability, and the united testimony of Matthew, Luke, and John is sufficient to justify the assumption that,

[1] *The Apostolic Gospel*, pp. 379-80. See also Hug, *Introd. to the N. T.*, vol. ii. pp. 291 ff.

whatever the sequel may have been, it did not end with fear and silence (Matt. xxviii. 8; Luke xxiv. 9; John xx. 2). The reader who insists that Mark means exactly what he says is, no doubt, perfectly reasonable; but the question is, What *does* Mark say? The leper was charged to say *nothing* to *any* man; but he was also instructed to go and show himself to the priest, who was presumably a man (Mark i. 44). When the daughter of Jaïrus was raised from the dead, according to Mark's report, the people in the house were charged much that *no man* should know this (v. 43); but the people themselves were obviously excluded. They could not be prevented from receiving the testimony of their senses (cp. vii. 36).

"In Mark vii. 24, the statement is made that Jesus entered into a house, and would have *no man* know it; but the disciples were with Him, and from them the fact could not be hid. And, finally, when Mark reports that Peter and James and John were instructed to tell *no man* what things they had seen at the Transfiguration of their Master (ix. 9), he does not intend to suggest that the secret was to be kept from the rest of the Twelve (cp. viii. 30; ix. 30).

"These parallel passages prove conclusively that the statement regarding the women is not incompatible with the supposition that they delivered their message to the disciples." And the same writer subsequently adds,[1] "The first words in Luke's fragment are,

[1] *Apost. Gosp.* p. 384.

'And they told all these things *to the Eleven and to the rest*' (ver. 9)." He infers, therefore, that Luke's statement and Mark's are "not mutually exclusive; for Mark simply means that the people of Jerusalem learned nothing from the women." [1]

Whether Mr Blair's view of the meaning of Mark's statement, viz., that the women said nothing to any outside the circle of disciples, be the correct one, or whether we may take it that Mark means (and perhaps said in the lost portion of his Gospel) that the silence was merely temporary, in either case it is highly improbable that the women never mentioned their experiences afterwards. Everything, both in the psychology and history of the event, points to the fact that they both would and did speak of it, and we must base our conclusions on the evidence generally, and the issue to which it points.

To the injunction of the angels, Matthew adds that Jesus Himself reiterated the command to tell His 'brethren' to go on before into Galilee, where they would see Him. This statement is also objected to by Prof. Schmiedel on the ground that it is a mere repetition of the angelic command; hence, it is not likely that Jesus ever gave it. But why should the injunction not be repeated by the Master Himself? We might easily, and with great probability, suppose that the women were at first too frightened, or too

[1] The *Gospel of Peter*, which agrees closely with Mark as to what the women saw and experienced, makes no mention of subsequent silence on the matter. But the end of this is also lost. See Appendix A.

doubtful as to the reality of what they saw and heard, to carry out the command. This might, indeed, form the ground of the statement in Mark: they may have hurried away with the *intention* of not mentioning it. In that case, if the message were to be delivered at all, an authoritative reiteration would be necessary. There is, in fact, no difficulty at all in such an explanation of the matter, though, of course, we know too little of the details to be able to affirm positively that such was the case.

CHAPTER II

THE APPEARANCE(S) TO THE *WOMEN* (*continued*)

In the more detailed account in the Fourth Gospel of the Appearance of Jesus to Mary Magdalene, there are several points of importance, the consideration of which we have reserved for a separate chapter.

In the first place, some difficulty is felt through the use of the word 'first' (Mark xvi. 9) by the writer of the Marcan Appendix. If we take this account, conjointly with the Johannine narrative, it would seem to be implied that Mary Magdalene was the *first* person to see Jesus after His Resurrection, whereas the whole tenor of the narrative in Matthew (and perhaps in the *original* Mark) seems to imply that the first Appearance was to the other women as they were returning home. This difficulty, however, is really a part of one already referred to, viz., whether we are to understand that there were *two* Appearances near the tomb, or only *one*. If the latter be meant, then the writer of the Marcan Appendix may mean that Jesus appeared to her *in company with* the other women mentioned in xvi. 1.

But this he does not say, and to judge from xvi. 1-8 (*and* the account in John), probably does not mean. The Marcan Appendix too is almost certainly not a

part of the original Gospel, and therefore we must not attribute too much importance to its detailed statements. As regards the *main* fact—an Appearance to Mary Magdalene alone[1]—it affords some confirmation, for although not a part of the author's own work, it undoubtedly represents very ancient tradition, given with great detail in the Fourth Gospel. On this point, however, it is impossible to speak positively, and we can only reach a provisional conclusion on the subject.

Now Prof. Schmiedel objects to the account of this Appearance, as given in the Fourth Gospel, largely because "its chief saying, 'I am not yet ascended,' etc., rests on a theory of the Holy Ghost that is peculiar to the Fourth Gospel";[2] but he adds, "if John's account can lay claim to authenticity we may be all the surer that it is a transformation of the account in Matthew." Of its being the latter, there are, he thinks, several indications:—"(1) In John, as in Matthew, one of Jesus' sayings is only a repetition of a saying of the angel's, 'Why weepest thou?' (2) A reminiscence of the fact that when the women met Jesus they had already retired from the sepulchre may perhaps be recognized in 'she turned herself

[1] The Syriac Version of the *Didascalia* seems to favour the view that there were two separate Appearances here: the *Coptic Nar.* is doubtful. (see Appendix C). In Tatian's *Diatessaron* Mary alone is mentioned (as in John); and Ephraem the Syrian, in his *Commentary*, appears to understand her to be Mary *the mother of Jesus*.

[2] Does he refer to the doctrine of the *Divinity* and *Personality* of the Holy Spirit? But these would seem to be already taught implicitly in Matt. xii. 32, xxviii. 19. Or to his hypothesis that the 'Spirit' in St John is the Risen Christ?

back' (John xx. 14). Only *one* woman appearing at the grave in John is perhaps to be explained by the observation that the recognition scene becomes more dramatic when Jesus has no need to utter more than a single word."

It may be said of this theory, which seems to rest upon a very slender basis, that at least it tends to support the *essential unity* of the two main records of the Appearances—the Tradition of Galilee (Matthew-Mark), and the Tradition of Jerusalem (Luke-John).[1] These two traditions, which are supposed to be entirely opposed to one another as regards the Scene of the Appearances, are certainly at one on the question of the Empty Tomb, and an Appearance of Jesus near it. In the case of John, however, *if* he borrowed, as Prof. Schmiedel seems inclined to suspect, he has certainly altered his sources quite beyond recognition, and it is just as easy, and more probable, to conceive that his account here is a mere variant of the Tradition of Jerusalem. That the writer of the Fourth Gospel was acquainted with the account of Matthew we may well believe most probable: that he took the trouble to recast it in the form in which it appears in John xx., we may be allowed seriously to doubt. It seems quite as reasonable to suppose that it came from one of the women concerned—probably Mary Magdalene[2] herself—in the experiences related.

[1] Mark xvi. 9-20 belongs to the *Jerusalem*, and John xxi. to the *Galilean* Tradition.

[2] For Renan's peculiar suspicion that Mary Magdalene herself may have

A very striking feature in the narrative of this Appearance is the mention of her non-recognition at first of Jesus. This fact is eagerly seized upon by the author of a well-known work,[1] who says with reference to it:—"To those who attach weight to these narratives, and consider them historical, it must appear astonishing that Mary, who up to the very last had been closely associated with Jesus, does not recognize him, when he thus appears to her, but supposes him at first to be the gardener. . . . After a couple of days, not to know Jesus whom she had daily seen for so long!"

It is not at all easy to see why this statement should cause such great difficulty to the mind of the impartial inquirer. Setting aside the mysterious change which is stated elsewhere to have come over the body, but without any destruction of *identity*, we find an ample reason in the following facts. In the first place we have a woman of an extremely sensitive temperament, who is overwhelmed with grief and agitation. She goes to the tomb with the idea of performing the last sad offices to the body of her beloved and lost Master. To her increased grief and amazement, however, the body is gone. Furthermore, in the place where the body had lain, there are two mysterious strangers, who give her no explanation of all this; one of them merely asks the

removed the body (*Apostles*, p. 69), see Appendix C. He evidently regards her as half-mad.

[1] *Supernatural Religion*, vol. iii. pp. 457 f.

strange and puzzling question, *why* she wept. And then, in her increasing agitation and distress, she turns round and sees through her tear-bedimmed eyes another Stranger, whom in her perturbation she hardly more than glances at: she jumps, as it were, to the conclusion—without second thought—that He must be the man who has charge of the grounds, and asks Him if He can explain where the body is. But when He *speaks*, she instantly recognizes who it is. All this would, we think, seem to most people very probable indeed, and very natural. It is an ordinary occurrence for people in an agitated and perturbed state of mind to make such mistakes as this.

But there is a further reason, which the author of *Supernatural Religion* also overlooks. Like the generality of mere negative critics he seems to misunderstand entirely the teaching of Christianity regarding the Resurrection. It is *not*—as he supposes—that of a mere *reanimation* of the former human body of Jesus. There was—we are told—a *transmutation* of some kind.[1] The body was indeed 'raised-up'; but at the same time it underwent some transforming change, which made it (to use St Paul's terminology) a 'glorified body.' But this fact is just what the learned author here completely fails to grasp. To him, there are *two* alternatives, and only two:—the old body, simply restored to life, and a mere spiritual phantasm; and the one concept, which (he thinks) underlies the narrative in one place,

[1] This question is treated more fully in chap. xi.

is irreconcilable with the other concept, which forms the basis in another. But all this is purely the author's imagination. The real underlying concept of the Evangelists is *neither* of these. Jesus rises again from the dead, they tell us: and in that rising His body is somehow *changed*. The old limitations of time and space and matter are more completely set aside; and henceforth He lives upon a higher plane, where these things either are not, or at least do not impede and hinder our actions as they do in this life. We cannot, perhaps, demonstrate such an existence, we cannot even explain, or depict to our minds exactly *how* these things can be, or are; but we can conceive them as quite reasonable and possible in a higher and holier state of being than the present. The narrative here may be historical, or unhistorical —that is another matter;—but there is nothing irrational or impossible depicted in it. And the mere fact that we cannot now actualize a third alternative existence, to mere body or mere spirit, is no argument whatever against its possibility and its actuality, in a higher condition of being. And what more probable, than that a body thus changed and 'glorified' would not be immediately recognized, especially when it was unexpectedly and suddenly presented to her view. The marvel would have been, had she, in her then state of mind, recognized it at once.

The author's further remarks are equally futile, and betray the same misapprehension of the situation. He continues (p. 458)—". . . It is somewhat

remarkable that the scene terminates so abruptly, and leaves so much untold that it would have been of the utmost consequence to know. What became of Jesus, for instance? Did he vanish suddenly? Or did he bid Mary farewell, and leave her like one in the flesh? Did she not inquire why he did not join the brethren? Whither he was going? It is scarcely possible to tell us less than the writer has done; and, as it cannot be denied that such minor points as where the linen clothes lay, or whether Mary 'turned herself *back*' (ver. 14), or, 'turned herself' (ver. 16) merely, cannot be compared in interest and importance to the supposed movements and conduct of Jesus under such circumstances, the omission to relate the end of the interview, or more particular details of it, whilst those graphic touches are inserted, is simply instructive."

The learned author of this work, we may be allowed here to remind him, is not present at a 'materialization' séance of the Spiritualist, or at the entertainment of a professor of legerdemain. Questions like these, though possibly appropriate in such situations as either of the above named, are entirely out of place in one like this. The Evangelist—truly or otherwise—professes to be lifting for us the corner of the veil of what (if true) can only be regarded as an awful mystery. And, if so, why then should we expect to have our natural instincts of curiosity—mere vulgar curiosity, very largely—thus indulged and gratified? Suppose too—which is not impro-

bable in such a case—that we could not at present understand the explanation, if given: Jesus at one moment in '*this*' world; at another moment in the '*other*'! We know at present too little about the mysteries of *life* and *death*, and *soul* and *God*—too little of the mystery of even *matter*[1]—to be able to grasp these things in their entirety; and, finally, the Narratives of the Resurrection are written to edify our spiritual faculties, *not* to minister to the inquisitive side of our minds.

But the misapprehensions of our author are not yet complete. He remarks further—quoting ver. 17 ("which seems emphatically to exclude further 'appearances,' and to limit the vision of the risen Jesus to Mary Magdalene")—that, "this message implies in the clearest way that the Ascension was *then*[2] to take place, and the only explanation of the abrupt termination of the scene immediately after this is, that *as he spoke, Jesus then ascended.* The subsequent appearances related in this Gospel must consequently either be regarded as an afterthought, or as visions of Jesus after he had ascended."

It is once more difficult for an impartial reader to see how these conclusions are drawn from the narrative. The announcement of Jesus (ver. 17) is simply declaratory, and the present tense here has its common implied future signification—'I ascend,'

[1] Cp. for example recent research into constitution, etc., of radium, etc., and the ultimate composition of matter.

[2] The italics are ours. Most negative critics endeavour to insist upon this implied meaning both here and in the Lucan Narrative.

etc. There is no time mentioned or implied, and no date fixed; nothing in the verse, or the rest of the narrative, leads us to suppose that it is meant He ascends *now*. All this exists merely in the fertile imagination of the author. Mary Magdalene is simply bidden to go and prepare the minds of the disciples for these future eventualities; and the subsequent meetings, on two successive occasions with the Twelve, narrated in this Gospel, show plainly that its author did not mean to imply that Jesus ascended forthwith.

Neither can the phraseology of the verse (17) be in any sense said "emphatically to exclude further appearances," etc. There is no hint of any kind that this Appearance will be the last, or that the 'Vision' of Jesus will be limited to the Magdalene. We have again fancy—pure fancy—read between the lines, and the simple straightforward narrative thereby distorted in its plain and obvious meaning. It is quite true that it does not satisfy our *curiosity*; but it is also equally true that it tells us quite as much as it is *necessary* for us to know, and that what it tells is in no sense either irrational or absurd.

CHAPTER III

THE APPEARANCES TO (1) *PETER*, (2) *JAMES*, AND (3) THE *TWO DISCIPLES* NEAR EMMAUS

(1) Luke xxiv. 34 ; 1 Cor. xv. 5 ; (2) 1 Cor. xv. 7 ; (3) Luke xxiv. 13-31 ; [Mark xvi. 12, 13]

(1) THE *first* Manifestation of Jesus to the disciples was, if we may trust the Lucan account, to Peter. There are, however, only two Canonical notices of it, both exceedingly brief, and no references to it in extant Apocryphal literature. Still the *fact* of its occurrence is well established by its admission into the Pauline list of Appearances (1 Cor. xv. 5-8), which is undoubtedly the oldest we possess.

Considering the prominent position of Peter amongst the Twelve, both during the lifetime of Jesus, and afterwards in the infant Church at Jerusalem, this paucity of reference to it, as well as the meagre account of the Appearance itself, is very curious. In a sense, it tells greatly in favour of its historical character ; for were the statement a mere invention, intended to exalt Peter in the eyes of the later Church, we should doubtless have had many sensational details given to us. As it stands, however, the narrative consists of *two words* in each account .

The brevity of these statements, and the absence

of all details, are generally accounted for by the supposition that communications of a very personal character passed between Peter and his Master, which it was unnecessary to record for public use. This is not unlikely, considering the circumstances and behaviour of Peter a short time previously.[1] Prof. Schmiedel would seem to accept this Appearance as historical—that is in accordance with his view of the nature of the Appearances.[2] He devotes, indeed, one long section (§ 37) to discussing 'The Situation of Peter,' which, he thinks, must have led up to this event, the summary of which we will set down below. And, in the first place, he asks, generally, whether it is not conceivable that "the state of deep dejection in which the disciples were left by Jesus" was likely to produce "subjective visions"? Then, in particular, he urges:—

(*a*) That "it was Peter alone who received the first vision." And that,

(*b*) "recollections of the predictions of Jesus" would recur to him on his return to Galilee; and that these reminiscences would tend to efface "the impression which his death had made."

(*c*) An "ineradicable conviction of the truth of his cause." And

(*d*) "the fact that Peter had denied his Lord."

We have, in short, he thinks, all the conditions

[1] Cp. Matt. xxvi. 69-75, and parallels.
[2] Practically subjective hallucinations.

ready to hand for such a (subjective) percept as is implied in the experience of Peter. Let us examine these suppositions.

(*a*) Both the Galilean and the Jerusalem Traditions state distinctly that there was a prior Appearance to the women. Peter is said (Luke and John) to have received the first news of this (in company with John), and it is probably to be inferred that he received the first Manifestation to the disciples. But, if it had been mere subjective imagination, originating a similar train of equally unreal conceptions in the others, tradition would surely have given us a more highly elaborated account of it;[1] whereas it is almost silent about it, thus showing that it cannot be the cause, and (subjective) origin, of the series of Appearances recorded. It is obvious, therefore, that the experience of Peter (whether *objective* or *subjective* in its nature) had made but little impression upon his fellow-disciples, and had not stimulated them to *imagine* that they too saw similar phantoms. For the next Appearance was to the Two Disciples before they had heard of Peter's experience.

(*b*) It is much more probable that Peter—as also the others—never really grasped the meaning of the predictions of Jesus, and that they therefore produced little or no effect upon their minds. They were simple unlettered countrymen, attracted, in

[1] We believe this is invariably the case. The originator of a series of subjective visions has the most intense experience. Those of his followers are more or less feeble reproductions; and the intensity of the visions diminishes steadily.

the first instance, by the spiritual and highly magnetic Personality of Jesus, full, moreover, of high hopes for the establishment of an earthly Messianic Kingdom which were totally inconsistent with the expectations and predictions of Jesus. The Narratives, indeed, give us the impression that they even brushed these aside as mere momentary weaknesses—entirely unpractical too—on His part: Peter on one occasion actually rebuking Him openly for entertaining such ideas.[1] It was, in fact, not till some time *after* the Resurrection that the truth of these things really dawned upon them, and they were able to see His meaning.

(*c*) The crucifixion and death of Jesus would far more probably impress them with the idea that He had made a great mistake somewhere, and failed completely in His Mission.[2] "We *hoped* that it had been He which should have redeemed Israel" is a true expression of their feelings of despair, and the loss of confidence which they felt in the truth of His cause.

(*d*) It is difficult to see how this would in any way act as a stimulus to subjective vision. Feelings of self-reproach, and perhaps regrets that he had not (as he had sometimes thought of doing) resorted to force to establish the Messiahship of Jesus,[3] we

[1] Cp. Matt. xvi. 23; Mark viii. 33; Luke iv. 8.

[2] Despite Isaianic and other prophecies, which might at least have suggested such a thing, the Jewish people *never* seem to have risen to the idea of a spiritual, and (in a worldly sense) unsuccessful Messiah. Hence the failure of the disciples to realise the situation.

[3] Cp. John vi. 15, etc.; also Matt. xxvi. 51 (where Peter seems to be referred to), and parallel passages.

can well imagine, in the case of Peter; but no predisposition to see a risen and triumphant Master. The terror and panic among the disciples at that time, upon which Prof. Schmiedel lays so much stress when he wishes to get them out of Jerusalem, are certainly not conditions favourable to that receptivity of mind, that ecstatic state, which is so fruitful in visions, and other creations of the 'subjective' mind. In short, we can see none of the conditions which might favour such an hypothesis. There is panic and confusion, and doubt and anxiety, and uncertainty—the only certainty being (apparently) that the Cause was *lost*;—but no signs of even unconscious preparation for a complete system of self-delusion, and the reconstruction under new conditions of a shattered ideal. Moreover, if we start with the theory of the entirely subjective character of Peter's experience, we are logically bound to extend it to the experiences of *all* the others. And, as a matter of fact, this is just what Prof. Schmiedel does. The experiences of the women at the tomb are either wholly unhistorical, or, possibly, the outcome of the excited imagination of Mary Magdalene. Similarly, the experiences of the Apostles collectively are the result of (perhaps) some telepathic communication to them from the mind of the emotional Simon Peter.

This theory is discussed in detail elsewhere (chaps. x., xi.); we will therefore only remark here that the postulated causes seem totally inadequate to produce the observed effects. That a very ancient tradition

exists, however, which records an Appearance to Peter, is evidenced by the Lucan Gospel and by St Paul; and in whatever way we explain this, the fact remains. And its primitive character is also very strongly supported by the very terseness and brevity of the statements in which it has come down to us.

(2) An Appearance to James, recorded in 1 Cor. xv., has a still more meagre attestation in Canonical literature. St Paul dismisses it also in two words—ὤφθη Ἰακώβῳ. ('He was seen by James'). Outside of the Canonical books, however, we have a somewhat detailed account of it in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*.[1] In this work it is recorded that James, after the Last Supper, had sworn to fast until the Lord had risen again, and that Jesus appeared to him and released him from his vow, having previously given the linen band, in which His body had been wrapped, to the High Priest's servant, who would appear to have been somewhere near the tomb at the time.

Against this account of the Appearance, Prof. Schmiedel advances the following objections:—

1. According to the Canonical Gospels, James was not present at the Last Supper.
2. It is the solitary Appearance on record of Jesus to an unbeliever.[2]

[1] Frag. 29, Naz. See Appendix A.

[2] Except, of course, that to the guard and elders in *Gospel of Peter* (Appendix A).

3. The story of the linen cloth is a most unlikely one: in John it is stated that these cloths were all found lying in the tomb.
4. It conflicts with Paul's list in the *order* of the Appearance.

1. According to Mr Nicholson,[1] "there can be no doubt that this James was not the son of Zebedee (whom Paul never mentions, and who had been dead [when Paul wrote] many years); but James, bishop of Jerusalem (Gal. ii. 9, 13), called also 'James, the Lord's brother' (Gal. i. 19)."

In the A.V. of Luke xxii. 14, we read that 'he sat down (at the Passover) and the twelve apostles with him.' Now 'James, the Lord's brother,' was certainly not one of the Twelve. The best codices, however, omit the word '*twelve*,' and there can be but little doubt that it is the gloss of some copyist. The James mentioned here is also referred to as an Apostle (Gal. i. 19). This title, indeed, we find extended in the New Testament beyond the Twelve, *e.g.* to both Paul and Barnabas (Rom. xvi. 17), and, it would seem, to Andronicus and Junias. This objection, therefore, is invalid, since there were no doubt others beside the Twelve (included as Apostles) at the Supper, and, if so, 'the Lord's brother' would be one of them.

2. The basis of Prof. Schmiedel's objection here is, that had Jesus really appeared to James in the presence of the priest's servant, the fact would have

[1] *Gospel acc. to the Hebrews*, p. 63, note.

possessed enormous historic and evidential importance, and the Evangelists and Paul would have seized upon and emphasized it.

This is, however, a very dangerous style of argument. The Appearances of Jesus were, it is certain, not for the purpose of converting hostile unbelievers, but for the confirmation and comfort of His own disciples. Just as He was unable to do any 'mighty works' on one occasion because of the aggressive unbelief about Him,[1] and as He uniformly declined to work any miracle to convince men that He was Messiah,[2] so, we may take it, He would deliberately *avoid* Manifestations to those who had despised and rejected Him. The case of this servant, however, is somewhat peculiar. If we may understand, as is probable, that Malchus is meant, the scene in the garden *may* have changed his views of the matter and led ultimately to his throwing in his lot with the disciples. This is, of course, mere conjecture; but, if correct, it makes this part of the story appear more probable.

3. This objection is a more reasonable one. Dismissing the above argument from John's statement as a mere detail, the accuracy of which cannot be insisted on, it is difficult to see why Jesus should take with Him one of the linen bands; or, again, why He should give such a thing to the servant. Any sugges-

[1] Cp. Matt. xiii. 58.

[2] Cp. Matt. xii. 38, xvi. 1; Mark viii. 11, 12; Luke xi. 16, 29; also Matt. xxvi. 2, etc. Our Lord's *rule* in these cases was consistently to refuse these 'signs.'

tion that it was a sort of 'trophy' may be set aside; and it is not likely that it would be deposited as 'evidence' of His Resurrection. The servant's object in being near the tomb is certainly obscure; interest lately awakened, curiosity, or a command from the priests to observe quietly what took place, these are not unlikely reasons.[1]

4. This last objection does not seem to possess great weight. Despite Prof. Schmiedel's confident assertions, we do not believe that St Paul's list was anything more than a rough one, written out from memory on the spur of the moment, or that he therein guarantees the *exact* number and sequence of the Appearances. Paul, it is true, distinctly states that this Appearance was *after* that to the Five Hundred, *i.e.* more than eight days after the Resurrection. The *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, on the other hand, seems distinctly to imply that it occurred during the morning of the Resurrection, or, at least, on that day.[2] And there is little doubt that St Paul's order (apart from the Canonical character of his evidence) is to be *preferred*. At the same time it is not certain that 1 Cor. xv. is prior to the source of the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, which undoubtedly embodies very ancient oral tradition.

On the whole, therefore, we may say that there is trustworthy evidence of an Appearance to James,

[1] But his testimony would not have been received. Cp. John ix. 27-34, etc.

[2] Another view is that it does not refer to the same Appearance as the one recorded in 1 Cor. xv. But this is improbable.

possibly during the Resurrection morning, although St Paul places it later. And the *Gospel according to the Hebrews*, despite the improbability of the detail of the linen cloth, corroborates the existence at a very early date of an account of this Appearance. The fact that it is not mentioned elsewhere, even in the Canonical Gospels, is of no great moment, since no writer professes to give a *complete* account of either the Life, or Appearances, of Jesus. All our records are written upon the principle of selection—completeness, and even exact chronological sequence, being disregarded; each writer, in fact, merely testifies to what he himself has gathered from some authoritative source, and those events which more particularly illustrate the aspects of the work of Jesus, which he undertakes to set forth.[1]

(3) The Appearance to the Two Disciples, while on their way to Emmaus,[2] which Prof. Schmiedel allows to be "a singularly characteristic narrative," is

[1] Ancient, and especially Oriental, ideas of both history and biography were quite different from modern and Western, in which chronological accuracy and completeness are more esteemed than a striking picture.

[2] Josephus (*B. J.* vii. 6. (6)) mentions an Emmaus as being sixty stades from Jerusalem. There were other places of the same name, the chief being a town on the shores of the Lake of Galilee. But this is out of the question. Kulônieh, about eight miles from Jerualem, has been suggested, and Col. Conder has called attention to a ruined place, Khamāsah, S.W. of Jerusalem, near the main road to the coast, as somewhat resembling the name in sound. The word is probably an Arabic corruption of Hammath, or Ammaus. Near the ruin are a spring of water and a little pool. (See Conder's paper in the *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, Oct. 1876; also Zschokke, *Das neutestamentliche Emmaus*, 1865, and criticism by Menke in Petermann's *Mitth.*, 1866.) Josephus says the word means 'a warm bath.'

recorded only by Luke, and (more briefly) in the Marcan Appendix. It belongs undoubtedly to the cycle of Lucan-Johannine, or Jerusalem, tradition, and *may* have been derived from the personal narrative of one of the two disciples.

Some of the details, however, are obscure. Who, for example, was the unknown disciple? Origen believed him to have been Peter.[1] But in that case, surely, either Peter himself would have spoken, or, at any rate, Cleopas would have appealed more distinctly to Peter (ver. 24). Further, both these disciples seem to be distinguished from the Eleven, of whom Peter was a member[2] (ver. 23). Wieseler believes the two to have been James, the son of Alphæus, or Clopas (or Cleopas), journeying to Emmaus with his father.[3] But Clōpas and Cleŏpas are probably distinct names, and if Luke had spoken of Clopas, or Alphæus, he would have given him the latter name (as in iv. 15, and Acts i. 13), and not one which occurs for the first time in John xix. 25, and subsequently to the time of Luke's writing. We have here again mentioned the strange inability to recognize Jesus, that we noted in the Appearance to Mary Magdalene.[4] Jesus, however, after having

[1] In that case this would perhaps be the Appearance to Peter. See note, p. 43.

[2] Hardouin thinks that perhaps Cephas (Gal. ii. 9; 1 Cor. ii. 9, 15) was a different person from Peter; and further (from 1 Cor. xv. 5) that he was the unknown companion of Cleopas. But it is evident that Paul speaks of Cephas as an Apostle, which would identify him with Peter.

[3] *Chron.* vol. i. p. 431. He thinks it the one referred to in 1 Cor. xv. 7.

[4] Schmiedel notices this as peculiar to the *earlier* Appearances. It is

heard their story reveals His identity in the 'breaking of bread.' He then, the narrative adds, 'vanished,' or 'became invisible' (ἄφαντος ἐγένετο).[1] Some commentators, wishing to avoid a 'supernatural' intimation here, have taken ἐγένετο with ἀπ' αὐτῶν, and made ἄφαντος adverbial, thus rendering it: 'He departed from them without being seen,' or 'noticed.' But this is an unnatural way of taking the Greek, and besides, something more than a merely unnoticed departure is evidently implied. The point, of course, raises the question as to the powers and properties of the risen body, which is dealt with elsewhere (chap. xi.).

This Appearance is usually regarded by the negative critic as purely the product of the inventive genius of some early Christian. Prof. Schmiedel, however, admits that if the story is a pure invention, it is "very difficult to understand why, of the disciples, one is nameless." [2] This is true; an inventor would almost certainly have been careful to supply us with the names of both disciples, besides probably adding much sensational detail.

The narrative, however—while distinctly implying

perhaps to be explained by the *change* in Jesus implied in the Narratives. Cp. Matt. xvii. 2; Mark ix. 2.

[1] Cp. ver. 37; vi. 36; xii. 40; xvi. 11, 12; xix. 17. ἄφαντος occurs nowhere else in Biblical Greek. In 2 Macc. iii. 34, ἀφανεῖς ἐγένοντο is used of angels ceasing to be visible. The *Latin* Versions vary very much, *e.g.*:—Nusquam comparuit ab eis (illis); non comparuit ab eis; invisus factus est; evanuit ex oculis eorum (*Vulg.*). None, however, suggest mere withdrawal. The *Syr. Sin.* has 'he was taken away from them.' So *Syr. Cur.* and *Pesh.*

[2] § 24 (*d*).

the 'supernatural'—is remarkable for the reserve and modesty with which the occurrence is described. Indeed, both for simplicity and pathos it stands unrivalled among the Resurrection Narratives. But in spite of this, and the admission above cited, Prof. Schmiedel does not seem quite satisfied with it. He says: "It is plain that the knowledge ascribed to the two disciples, so skilfully embodied in this narrative, could not have been drawn from the events described by Luke, even if they had literally happened to them on the Resurrection day; it is naturally the product of a long growth, and that too in Gentile-Christian circles, in which the corporeal element in Jesus was neither so familiar, nor so important, as in the primitive Apostolical." [1]

That is to say, he regards the fact of Jesus vanishing suddenly to indicate some early tendencies towards Gnostic and Docetic modes of thought. The earliest Christians, he would argue, held to more *materialistic* views of the risen Jesus. This we take leave seriously to doubt. Moreover, it is utterly at variance with his own theory of the *phantasmal* nature of the Appearances. Such a view, too, brings up the old question as to the complete antithesis of *body* and *spirit*, and the possibility of some *third condition*

[1] Luke elsewhere seems quite familiar with the 'corporeal element' in Jesus. Cp. xxiv. 39, 43, etc. Prof. Kirsopp Lake says of the Emmaus incident (*The Historical Evidences for the Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, p. 218), that it "reads as though it were based on fact"; and thinks that it is "probably a genuine remnant of the original tradition of the Church at Jerusalem, which has suffered a little in the course of transmission."

of being which may mediate between these two, and partake of the nature of both.

That the early Christians believed Jesus able, in some way, to withdraw Himself from the sight of those around, is evident both from the other Resurrection Narratives, and the general tenor of the Gospels.[1] They may not have fully realized what this meant; but at all events, if we may trust the records, they fully accepted both the possibility *and* the fact. Those who afterwards developed Gnostic tendencies simply carried out these concepts to an extreme conclusion:—they denied *all corporeal reality* to His body, and (in some cases at least) to matter itself.[2] Prof. Schmiedel would, therefore, explain the genesis of this narrative as "a reminiscence of a celebration of the Lord's Supper."[3] And, he thinks that "the mysterious character of the presence of the risen Jesus at the Supper, appears at Emmaus in his disappearance when the two disciples recognized him."

The far-fetched character of this attempt to account for the origin of the narrative only shows the difficulties under which the subjectivists labour, when they endeavour to explain away all objective reality in the case of the Resurrection. The early Christian conceived of Christ as *spiritually* present at the Eucharist; but this concept would never lead to

[1] The belief is still common in the East, that persons of transcendent spiritual gifts have such powers.

[2] Cp. the teaching of the Hindu Vedânta—everything *material*, etc., is illusive in its nature, and has no *real* existence. Similarly Plato (Zeller's *Plato*, pp. 293 ff.), and, perhaps, St Paul (2 Cor. iv. 18).

[3] § 29 (*c*).

the formulation of a story in which He was first of all present before them in *bodily* and *tangible* form, and then, in some sudden manner, all at once *invisible* to their bodily eyes. The analogy of the Supper would rather suggest the *Visible* continuing to act as the shrine of the *Invisible*, than any *change* of the former into the latter. Jesus here simply uses the forms and the words of blessing, which they had so recently heard from His lips, as a means of revealing His identity to their somewhat dull spiritual apprehensions, and to convey delicately a gentle rebuke.

This incident is also seized upon by the author of *Supernatural Religion*, who treats it in his usual style of criticism. He says,[1] "According to the third Synoptic, the first appearance of Jesus to anyone after the resurrection was not to the women, and not to Mary Magdalene, but to two brethren, who were not Apostles at all, the name of one of whom, we are told, was Cleopas. The story of the walk to Emmaus is very dramatic and interesting; but it is clearly legendary. None of the other Evangelists seem to know anything about it. It is difficult to suppose that Jesus should after his resurrection appear first of all to two unknown Christians in such a manner, and accompany them in such a journey.

[1] Vol. iii. pp. 459-61. Cp. with this the treatment of it by Renan (*Apostles*, pp. 18-21). Here the mysterious Stranger is "a pious man well-versed in the Scriptures," and when he breaks bread at the evening meal, his gestures and speech recall Jesus to their minds. Lost in the reverie of sad thoughts, they awake to find the Stranger—gone!

The particulars of the story are to the last degree improbable, and in its main features incredible, and it is indeed impossible to consider them carefully without perceiving the transparent inauthenticity of the narrative. The two disciples were going to a village called Emmaus, threescore furlongs distant from Jerusalem, and while they are conversing Jesus joins them, 'but their eyes were holden that they should not know him.' He asks the subject of their discourse, and pretends ignorance, which surprises them. Hearing the explanation of their perplexity and depression, he says to them: 25. 'O foolish and slow of heart to believe all that the prophets spake. 26. Was it not necessary that Christ should suffer these things, and enter into his glory? 27. And beginning at Moses, and at all the prophets, he expounded unto them in all the scriptures the things concerning himself.' When they reach the village, he pretends to be going further (ver. 28); but they constrain him to stay. 30. 'And it came to pass, as he sat at meat with them, he took bread, and blessed and brake, and gave to them; 31. And their eyes were opened, and they knew him, and he vanished out of their sight.'

"Now why all this Comedy? Why were their eyes holden that they should not know him? Why pretend ignorance? Why 'make as though he would go further'? Considering the nature and number of the alleged appearances of Jesus, this episode seems most disproportionate and inexplic-

able. The final incident completes our conviction of the unreality of the whole episode: after the sacramental blessing of bread, Jesus vanishes in a manner which removes the story from the domain of history. On their return to Jerusalem, the Synoptist adds that they find the Eleven, and are informed that 'the Lord was raised and was seen by Simon.' Of this appearance we are not told anything more."

These objections, raised by the author of *Supernatural Religion*, it must be again repeated, show a complete misapprehension of the Gospel Narratives. In the first place, Luke does *not* state that the first Appearance of Jesus was ('not to the women and not to Mary Magdalene but) to the two brethren': he simply omits any mention of Appearances to the former, and, in the next place, *implies* (ver. 34) that the first Appearance, in the case of the disciples, was to *Peter*, previously to the Emmaus incident.[1] Neither can it be concluded that the other Evangelists know nothing about the walk to Emmaus. They do not *mention* it; but no Evangelist mentions every incident (however important) in the life of Jesus, which is recorded by another. We also fail to see why Jesus should not, for some good and sufficient reason, appear to 'two unknown Christians.' And, were they so unknown? The narrative gives the name of one, and rather implies that both were well-

[1] Cod. D, it is worth noting, reads here λέγοντες (for λέγοντας), thus making *the two disciples* announce the Appearance to Peter. Resch adopts this reading, which might be the true one, if it could be shown that Peter was one of the two disciples. See note, p. 37.

known disciples, and held in some estimation. Nor can we see wherein the 'Comedy' consists; or the objections to the 'pretended ignorance'; or, again, why Jesus should not (for some sufficient reason) 'make as though he would go further.' The 'final incident'—the disappearance of Jesus—can only 'complete the conviction of the unreality of the whole episode' in the case of a person who is wholly enthralled by a system of crass materialism, and who denies *in toto* all possibility of a spiritual and unseen world. With such a person all discussion of a question like this is useless, so long as he lays down that *datum* as the preliminary postulate of his thesis. If we are to remove 'from the domain of history' all that belongs to the category of what is often termed the 'supernatural,' then we must also expunge the concept of God, and plunge ourselves into the abyss of mechanistic materialism. This, indeed, would seem to be the author's general outlook. And, if so, then all discussion with him of the essentials of Christianity becomes superfluous.

In conclusion, we may say (with Dr Plummer) that the account has all the effect of *personal* experience. We have only to compare it with such narratives as those found in Apocryphal stories to see that it treats the mystery of the supersensuous with a simplicity and reserve which strongly point to the narrative being a record of facts, though, at the same time, remarkable facts, which are not met with in everyday experience.

CHAPTER IV

THE APPEARANCES TO THE *ELEVEN* AND THE *FIVE HUNDRED*

(1) Luke xxiv. 36-49; John xx. 19-23; [Mark xvi. 14-18]; 1 Cor. xv. 5; (2) John xx. 24-29; (3) Matt. xxviii. 16-20; 1 Cor. xv. 5, 6; (4) Luke xxiv. 50-53; [Mark xvi. 19-20]; Acts i. 3-9

(1) An Appearance to the Eleven and their companpanions (τοὺς ἕνδεκα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτοῖς), on the same day as that at Emmaus, is recorded by the Evangelists who represent the Jerusalem tradition, in the Marcan Appendix, and (possibly) referred to by St Paul. Luke's statement of it is thus criticized by the author of *Supernatural Religion*:[1]—

"Whilst the two disciples from Emmaus were relating these things to the Eleven, the third Synoptist states that Jesus himself stood in the midst of them: ver. 37. 'But they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they saw a spirit.' The apparent intention is to represent a miraculous sudden entry of Jesus into the midst of them, just as he had vanished at Emmaus; but in order to reassure them Jesus is represented as saying: ver. 39. 'Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and behold; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones

[1] Vol. iii. pp. 461 ff.

as ye see me having. 41. And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them: Have ye any food? 42. And they gave him a piece of broiled fish. 43. And he took it, and did eat before them.'

"The care with which the writer demonstrates that Jesus rose again with his own body is remarkable; for not only does he show his hands and feet, we may suppose for the purpose of exhibiting the wounds made by the nails by which he was affixed to the Cross; but he eats, and thereby proves himself to be still possessed of his human organism. It is apparent, however, that there is direct contradiction between this and the representation of his vanishing at Emmaus, and standing in the midst of them now. The Synoptist who is so lavish in his use of miraculous agency naturally sees no incongruity here. One or other alternative must be adopted. If Jesus possessed his own body after his resurrection, and could eat and be handled, he could not vanish; if he vanished, he could not have been thus corporeal. The aid of a miracle [1] has to be invoked in order to reconcile the representations. We need not criticize the address which he is supposed to make to his disciples; [2] but we must call attention to the one point that Jesus (ver. 49) commands the disciples

[1] The author here would evidently define a 'miracle' as something contrary to all reason and established cosmic 'law.' As a matter of fact a miracle is nothing of the sort; it is the product of certain higher and more spiritual laws which supersede the lower and material laws—a supernormal event.

[2] See note, p. 462.

to tarry in Jerusalem until they be 'clothed with power from on high.' This completes the exclusion of all appearances in Galilee; for the narrator proceeds to say that Jesus led them out towards Bethany, and lifted up his hands and blessed them: 51. 'And it came to pass, while he blessed them, he parted from them, and was carried up into heaven'; whilst they returned to Jerusalem, 'where they were continually in the temple praising God.'"

The almost fatuous misunderstanding of the Gospel narrative, of which we have already made mention, is here repeated by the author. At the risk of seeming tedious we must again say that the author's sharply drawn antithesis of 'spirit' and 'body' does not meet the facts of the case; it exists only in his imagination. The Resurrection body of Jesus is most plainly depicted in the Gospels—and by St Paul—as being neither the one nor the other, in the sense with which we are familiar. It is neither the former body simply reanimated, nor a mere unsubstantial *imago*, or phantom. What we have presented to us is a picture of the God-Man Jesus raised again to life, and in both *body* and *soul transfigured and elevated* (*as regards His human nature*) *to a higher and more spiritual plane.* And on this higher plane—upon which His Divine nature is in some sense more operative—He possesses certain additional faculties and powers which transcend human knowledge, and often, indeed, human language.

We repeat that there is nothing irrational in this statement of the matter. Little or nothing is known of even mere human possibilities on a higher and more spiritual plane of existence, except that they are probably much greater than we have even dreamt of. Furthermore, recent scientific research has shown us that even *matter* is not the mere impassive, and rigidly unchangeable entity, which it was formerly conceived to be.[1] And, assuming for a moment that Jesus was—as the Gospels intimate—no mere man, why should He not have certain higher powers, *e.g.* that of varying the manifestation of His body;—be able to appear and disappear at will; be handled and even eat, as the writer here states? In one sense, it would be, largely at least, a question of power over matter and its manifestation to the senses. The statement that is here made does not imply anything that is irrational or absurd, but only something which is not within the scope of ordinary human experience, which has—at its best—but a very limited range. And since this is indisputably the case, we have no right to dismiss what we sometimes contemptuously term the 'supernatural' with impatient scorn and derision. Such an attitude of mind may have been justifiable, to some extent,

[1] *E.g.* the case of radium, etc. The destruction of matter, *quâ* matter, and its actual resolution into an imponderable substance (? æther), of a fluent and probably electrical nature, is now an established fact. *Force* and *matter* are probably two different forms of one and the same thing. Matter represents a stable form of intra-atomic energy; heat, light, etc., represent unstable forms of it. (Dr Le Bon's *Evolution of Matter*, and *Evolution of Forces*.)

'in the times of our former ignorance,' but is certainly not so now. If matter were the rigid unyielding substance which we were once taught to believe it was, then such transformations as from the organized and *visible* to the organized but *invisible*, without a destruction of the organism—might possibly be beyond even Almighty power. But matter is nothing of the kind. We have reason for thinking, that since the so-called atomic constituents of matter can, and undoubtedly do, undergo disintegration and transmutation and (it may be) reintegration, so too a Being of Divine origin and power, could exercise similar control over even a material organism—over (let us suppose) a transmuted and glorified body, such as is implied in the evangelistic narrative.[1] In any case, the concept is not an irrational one, as the author would imply here; and we are, therefore, *not* bound to accept the alternative of either a material and unchangeable body, *or* an immaterial and unsubstantial spirit.

Again, the author has here deliberately, and for his own special purposes, made the narrative in vers. 50-53 follow continuously and immediately upon the Manifestation described in vers. 36-49. The same

[1] A simple—though very far from complete—analogue, is the different physical states in which many (chemically) compound bodies are capable of existing without undergoing any disintegration. Thus we have *water* as a visible solid (ice), again a visible fluid and an invisible gas. This is, of course, something widely different from a similar transformation in the case of an organized living being; but it helps our imagination somewhat, in trying to grasp such a concept.

error is committed also by Prof. Schmiedel, who says,[1] "Luke enumerates a *consecutive* series of appearances and brings it to a close (xxiv. 51) with the express statement that Jesus parted from them, and *all these occurrences are represented as having happened on one and the same day.*" [2] A careful study of the text of the original should have taught him better. The narrative is really a *condensed* one, the last four verses of the chapter obviously referring only to the final incident,[3] which Luke elsewhere [4] distinctly states occurred some *forty days afterwards*, and which he there describes in some detail. This statement, therefore, does *not* 'dispose of all appearances in Galilee.' [5]

There may have been (as Matthew [and Mark] states) Appearances there, or there may not (as Luke does *not* state); but in any case they are not excluded by Luke's version of the Appearances to the Eleven.

The Johannine account of this Appearance [6] agrees closely with the Lucan. The chief difference is, that the former writer tells us that the doors of the room were shut. Consequently he—as also Luke—*implies*

[1] § 3 (*a*). The italics are ours. So also Strauss, Keim, Weizsäcker, etc.

[2] The discontinuity of the narrative here is recognized in the A.V. by a paragraph mark. It is obviously implied.

[3] The Ascension.

[4] Acts i. 3.

[5] See chap. ix.

[6] The author of *Sup. Rel.* (vol. iii. p. 463) affects to think that the Johannine account here refers to a separate Appearance from that recorded by Luke, and then asks, "Is it probable that Jesus appeared twice upon the same evening to the eleven disciples?" Probable, or not, the Narratives do not say, or imply, that He did; they refer—with slight variation—to the same Appearance.

that Jesus had the supernormal power of passing through material substances. This is, as we have pointed out, neither impossible nor absurd, under other conditions than those with which we are now familiar.

Again, Prof. Schmiedel remarks here, that "John knows nothing of Jesus having eaten." John, it is true, *omits* the statement; but that is not tantamount to saying—or even implying—that he *knows* nothing of it. The Professor, no doubt, believes that the 'eating' is a later and legendary addition to the narrative. But, if so, it is at least remarkable that the *latest* (and, as he would have it, the least historical) Gospel should omit this final addition to the legend!

Another slight variation in the two accounts, noticed by Prof. Schmiedel, is that, "besides his hands Jesus shows not his feet, but his *side*" (in John), the piercing of which indeed is mentioned only in the Fourth Gospel; and he also adds, "but he does not suffer himself to be touched, yet without expressly forbidding this, as he had done in the case of Mary Magdalene."

Such small variations as the above are, as a matter of fact, really important, though indirectly so, as evidences of the entire independency and veracity of the narratives in which they occur. Two, or more, separate narrators, writing moreover after the lapse of years, might well, and, indeed, probably would, thus vary in the details of their story. Of

course, Prof. Schmiedel lays stress upon this minor fact, because he argues (elsewhere) that the spear-wound is not historical; it is invented, he thinks, for doctrinal reasons, and therefore peculiar to the Fourth Gospel.[1] This hypothesis seems, however, to rest on very slight grounds—merely non-corroboration elsewhere. It *may* nevertheless be historical.

The Marcan Appendix gives a very condensed account of this Appearance. Like Luke and John, it lays stress upon the persistent incredulity of the disciples, and adds that Jesus rebuked their unbelief. So Paul, in his Letter to the Corinthians, dismisses it in a few words, and adds nothing to the statements of the Gospels.

(2) The second Appearance of Jesus to the Eleven, eight days afterwards, recorded only in the Fourth Gospel, is very similar in its general character to the one we have just been examining. On this occasion, however, Thomas—who is stated (by John) to have been absent on the former occasion, and who declared subsequently that nothing short of tangible evidence would satisfy him—is present. Jesus is then represented as appearing in a similar sudden and unexpected manner, and inviting Thomas to examine His hands and side. Thomas, convinced by these proofs, exclaims, 'My Lord, and my God!'

[1] So also other critics of this school. The writer, however, states that he *saw* it inflicted. If an invention, it certainly shows considerable and accurate physiological observation and knowledge.

The author of *Supernatural Religion* here also makes much of certain differences in general detail. While, "in the Synoptic (Luke), the wound made by the mythical lance is ignored," in the Fourth Gospel no mention is made of the wounds in the *feet*. He then proceeds to express great doubt as to whether, "in the opinion of the Fourth Evangelist, the feet of Jesus were nailed to the cross at all, or whether, indeed, they were so in fact." Since the feet of crucified criminals were sometimes merely tied, "opinion is divided as to whether Jesus was so bound, or whether the feet were likewise nailed." [1] This latter point (which he admits is "not important for our examination") is surely one upon which the early Christians were better informed than we can possibly be. And as regards the examination by Thomas of the wounds of Jesus, surely it is the purpose of both writers simply to set forth that there was a general examination of these, each writer particularizing merely those which appealed to him most. The more practical Synoptist with his medical training notes—and it may be had only heard of—the agonizing wounds in the hands and feet; while the more mystical author of the Fourth Gospel draws attention to the spear-wound, painless, indeed, to an already dead man, but possessing, in the view of the writer, great symbolic meaning.[2] There would seem,

[1] *Sup. Rel.* vol. iii. pp. 463 f. He also thinks that if the feet were *not* nailed, that fact would lend considerable support to the Swoon Theory, which the author appears inclined to favour. See Appendix C (1).

[2] Renan (*Life of Jesus*, pp. 292-3) appears to accept the wound as historical.

in fact, to be the old principle, that of *selection*, again at work here. Perhaps also the question of precise information may be concerned. But whatever the explanation may be, there is no contradiction.

Again, the author asserts that there is a contradiction between the statement in John xx. 21-23, and the corresponding Lucan narrative. According to the former, he says, the Holy Spirit is bestowed then and there at the first Appearance upon the *Ten*; according to the latter, it was given to the *Eleven*, and for the first time at the final interview before the Ascension. This seems a valid objection; let us, therefore, examine it.

The account given of the *first* Appearance by the writer of the Fourth Gospel, it will be remembered, emphasized the fact that Thomas was absent: he would therefore naturally be excluded from the gift then bestowed. When present at the final Appearance, he would, if it were renewed, share in such renewal. The narrative here may, and perhaps does, show some confusion of statement; but we cannot see any patent contradiction in it, or any insuperable difficulty in the (perhaps implied) renewal of the gift of the Holy Spirit. Luke certainly does not *say* (or, it would seem, necessarily imply) that it was given for the *first* time at the last meeting. There are, indeed, several previous instances of the conferring of similar spiritual powers upon the disciples, individually or collectively. For example, after the

confession of Peter, Jesus gave him[1] the power of 'loosing' and 'binding' both on earth and in heaven. Again, when sending the Seventy upon their mission, Jesus conferred upon them spiritual powers of both bodily and mental healing, and the control over evil spirits.[2] There is, therefore, some precedent for a renewed gift of spiritual powers. And, in any case, since Luke details at some length the gift of these powers at the time of the Ascension, and again at Pentecost, he may, for that reason, omit the notice of it at this Appearance; or, yet another alternative, his information may possibly not have included this instance. In any case, making allowance for confusion of narrative, and defective information, as well as subsequent fuller statement, there does not appear to be any contradiction. Luke may, or may not, have been informed of a previous gift in the Upper Room. Jesus may, or again may not, have bestowed it. The ejaculation of Thomas, too, would seem to be rather the natural and spontaneous remark of an awestruck man, than an indication of 'the hand of the artist' adding an artificial and legendary touch. What other conclusion could be drawn than that no one of less than Divine origin and power could die and rise again from the dead; could be present in all the apparent reality of flesh and blood, and yet both appear and disappear suddenly? Assuming such powers, the plain inference would be that such a person must

[1] Matt. xvi. 19, 20. [2] Luke x. 1-17.

surely be none other than God Himself in human form.

(3) We now come to a series of recorded Appearances, which, owing chiefly to the very meagre and condensed accounts which have reached us, it is extremely difficult to differentiate, and arrange in any definite sequence.

The first Synoptist gives us a short account of (apparently) another Appearance to the Eleven in Galilee.[1] And we are told that here again 'some doubted.' Brandt supposes[2] that these words are a gloss, because, in those which immediately follow, Jesus passes over the doubts of the disciples without remark, instead of resolving them, as on previous occasions. The tendency amongst the disciples to persistent doubt (probably quite a natural one) is noticed, however, by Luke and John also, as we have seen.

But the question arises, if these doubts had been previously set at rest, as both John and Luke would seem to imply, why should there be this recrudescence of them? This question might be met in various ways. We might reply that doubt is very deeply implanted in some natures, and that, even after it has been apparently resolved, it is very liable to recur again under appropriate conditions. The

[1] It has been suggested that by "Galilee" is meant one of the summits of the Mount of Olives, near Jerusalem. See, however, chap. ix. pp. 121.

[2] *Evang. Gesch.*, 1893.

usual explanation, however, is to suppose that St Paul's reference to an Appearance to the Five Hundred brethren is identical with this. Thus, although the Eleven had been convinced, many of the Five Hundred, who saw Him now perhaps for the first time, remained doubtful. This solution has seemed to many critics a gratuitous and unlikely hypothesis.[1] At any rate, owing largely to the extreme brevity of the Matthæan narrative, it is impossible either to prove or disprove this explanation. On the whole, perhaps, it seems more probable that the Appearance to the Five Hundred is an entirely separate one, which (with the exception of St Paul's brief but clear notice) has not been recorded in writing. And it would seem to be not impossible that the Synoptist's information has led him astray here, and that he is really referring to one of the previous Appearances recorded by Luke and John as taking place in Jerusalem. This view, however, brings up the whole problem of the Galilean Appearances, which there is a tendency amongst certain modern critics to set aside altogether in favour of the Jerusalem tradition. This question is more fully treated elsewhere.[2] In any case there is undoubtedly some disagreement, or confusion, in the narrative at this point. The Appearance to the Five Hundred, however—whether

[1] Steck thinks it is an artificial way of describing the mission of the Twelve and the other disciples. The Twelve would represent the *narrower* circle destined for the mission to the Jews; the Five Hundred the *wider* circle referred to in Luke x. 1. But, if so, why *five hundred* instead of seventy?

[2] Chap. ix.

in Galilee or near Jerusalem—seems to rest upon a primitive and indisputable tradition. It is recorded by St Paul (*circa* A.D. 55), and stated by him to be derived from the evidence of many Christians who had been present, and were then alive. He must, therefore, have had it described to him by eye-witnesses.

(4) The last mention of Appearances to the Eleven is made in Acts i. 3-8, and possibly referred to by St Paul in 1 Cor. xv. 7. The narrative here probably implies several Appearances to, but not a continuous sojourn with, the Apostles. This point, however, is somewhat difficult to decide, as the account is vaguely worded. If so, no exact, or detailed record seems to have been kept of either the number or the occasion of them. We are again told that the real and objective nature of these Appearances was vouched for by 'many proofs,' *i.e.* most probably tangible and audible as well as visible proofs. The chief emphasis, it is true, is laid upon the *visual* evidence; 'being seen by them during forty days' (δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσαράκοντα ὀπτανόμενος,) says the author of the Acts. The same final Appearance is also referred to by Luke (xxiv. 50-52). At this Jesus, he tells us, 'led them as far as Bethany, and he lifted up his hands and blessed them. And it came to pass' that 'while he blessed them, he was parted from them and carried up into heaven.'

This final departure seems to differ in some respects

from the previous 'vanishing'; but probably we are intended to understand that it partook largely of that mode of withdrawal from human sight.[1]

[1] Although the subject of the Ascension does not come within the scope of this Dissertation, a few words thereupon may not be unfitly added here. Prof. Lovejoy thus writes (*Hibbert Journal*, April 1908, p. 503): "This Story [of the Resurrection] is inextricably involved with, and unintelligible apart from the complementary story of the Ascension, with its crude scene of levitation; and this, in turn, is meaningless without the scheme of cosmic topography that places a heaven somewhere in space in a direction perpendicular to the earth's surface at the latitude and longitude of Bethany."

The above objection rests entirely—in its turn—on a crudely realistic view of the world as *manifested to us* under the subjective conditions of space and time. It has been the misfortune of modern physical science to be obliged to encourage this conception of the universe. This is no doubt unavoidable if phenomena are to be studied scientifically; but philosophically it is an error, and does not represent the final analysis of Reality. The present world—apparently spread out before us in spatial and temporal form—is but the symbol of another, and to us, in our present condition, unseen world, to which a higher and truer reality belongs.

And the passage from this present seen into the other unseen world is *not by way of spatial transition*. Such a conception is the mere symbolical use of ideas.

This aspect of the question is to some extent dealt with in Tait and Stewart's *Unseen Universe*; but thoroughly to understand it requires some acquaintance with the rudiments, at least, of Philosophy.

CHAPTER V

THE APPEARANCE TO THE *SEVEN* ON THE SHORE OF THE LAKE OF GALILEE

[John xxi. 1-14]

We have now to deal with the record of an Appearance, the veridical character of which depends to some extent upon the authenticity of the Johannine Appendix. This is a matter of dispute; but the matter will be treated here mainly from an exegetical point of view.

The question of authenticity is, of course, not whether it is appendical, or no—this fact is obvious to the careful reader—but whether or not it is by the same hand as the Gospel itself. Prof. Schmiedel denies offhand that it is; it "does not come from the same author with the rest of the Gospel."

This is an assertion which is easily made; a minute analysis of the document, however, has convinced many able critics that it is by no means a foregone conclusion. On the whole, perhaps, the evidence is against it.

According to Prof. Schmiedel, the disciples had all fled at once from the garden in terror and confusion to Galilee, and there returned to their regular occupa-

tions. His theory is so far borne out by this chapter that Simon Peter is here represented as saying to the others that he intends to 'go a-fishing.' The general tenor of this remark, however, coupled with that of their reply, 'We also come with thee,' raises the suspicion that this was rather by way of an occasional excursion, than an instance of the usual day's routine at that time.

If the disciples had but recently come, and with the intention of remaining for a few days only, such a remark, and answer, would be quite pertinent and intelligible. Otherwise, it would be somewhat superfluous. Poor men, on a temporary visit to their old homes, would probably be thus obliged to put in an occasional day's work at their old occupation. This point, however, we pass by.

The first objection raised by Prof. Schmiedel is to the statement in the narrative that this Appearance is the *third*: this is so, he says, only, "if that to Mary Magdalene (xx. 11-17) is *not* included in the reckoning"—adding, "but originally it was certainly meant to be included, the number 3 playing a great part in the Fourth Gospel."[1] The latter remark is true; but we do not see how it necessarily affects either the truth of the story,

[1] It is certainly remarkable for the prominence given to both the Hebrew sacred numbers 3 and 7. Thus, there are 3 Passovers, 3 visits to Galilee, 3 sayings on the Cross; 7 affirmations by Jesus of His Mission beginning with "I am," 7 miracles, and 7 forms of testimony to Christ. But the author does not mean thereby to imply that there were no others. He selects 3—or 7—with the idea of producing a—according to Jewish ideas—*perfectly balanced* book.

or even the question of the authorship of the Appendix.

It is quite possible for the *author* of the Gospel, supposing that he added this Supplement subsequently and was desirous still to keep his record of *three* Appearances, to *omit* the one to Mary Magdalene —previously reckoned in—and count them afresh upon a different principle. And, in point of fact, this is just what the writer has done; and he has been careful to note the different mode of reckoning: —'This is now the third time that Jesus was manifested to his *disciples*.' Mary Magdalene was never a 'disciple'; and so the addition leaves the new way of reckoning still a correct one.

On the other hand, such a change might also be made by a different author. The fact, too, that the original Gospel contained three (and *only* three) Appearances—including that to Mary Magdalene—and that the writer who added the Appendix wished to retain the same total, and therefore excluded that to Mary Magdalene, neither proves nor disproves the historicity either of the excluded Appearance, or of the one subsequently added. And, we might add, neither the author, nor the writer of the Appendix thereby *limit* the Appearances to three.

Again, Prof. Schmiedel thinks that the whole "narrative of xxi. 1-14, is governed by the intention to do justice to what is said in Matthew and Mark, according to which the Appearances of the risen Jesus were in Galilee." But here, again, this intention

may emanate from the original author, on a further consideration. The next statement, that the writer of chap. xx. is "plainly with deliberate purpose following Luke, who *restricts* these appearances to Jerusalem," is simply incorrect. If it were amended to "*omits* any mention of Appearances in Galilee"—in that form it would be strictly accurate.[1]

Prof. Schmiedel admits that this supplementary chapter "shows dependence on chaps. i.-xx. at many points." This is so; and the fact would seem to point either to the same authorship, or else to the deliberate study of the previous author's work with a view to the fraudulent imitation of it. The differences, however, which are numerous, tell against the latter alternative; and both similarities and differences *might* be accounted for by the reasonable hypothesis that, during the lapse of years, a writer's style and vocabulary, as well as outlook, generally change; while they do not, as a rule, become entirely different. But it seems impossible to decide absolutely either way.

Prof. Schmiedel further objects that:—

(*a*) Peter appears in xxi. as a *fisherman* (as in Synoptists); in John i. 35-40, as *a disciple of John.*

(*b*) The 'sons of Zebedee'—so termed in xxi.—are nowhere else in the Gospel thus named.

[1] This—and similarly inaccurately worded phrases—are a very unfair way of putting what (stated in another way) is a simple fact. So stated, however, they are merely gratuitous, and *ex parte*, assumptions.

(*c*) The *parousia* of Jesus is taken in a *literal* sense in xxi. 22; in xiv. 16-18, and xvi. 7, 13, the second Advent is identified with the coming of the Holy Spirit in the hearts of believers.

In considering these several points raised, it is obvious that:—

(*a*) Peter may have been both a disciple of John and a fisherman; and the writer of the Gospel may have been quite aware of the fact. As time went on, however, he was more generally known to the Church as a fisherman, and the writer of the Appendix (whether the author or no) gives him his later, and then better-known designation. This fact in no way proves—or even pointedly suggests—different authorship.

(*b*) Similarly the title 'sons of Zebedee' (used by the Synoptists) became the *usual* designation of James and John; and this came rather later into more general acceptance. This again *may* well have been adopted afterwards by the author, if he took up his pen once more.

(*c*) The *parousia* of xxi. 22, and the advent of the *Paraclete* in xiv. 16-18, xvi. 7, 13, refer to two totally different events, both predicted by Christ. The former has reference to the second coming of Jesus at some remote future time; the latter to that of the Holy Spirit[1] in the (then) near future. Hence, there is no contradiction, or confusion, in the mind of the writer here.

[1] The representative, *in time*, of Christ upon earth. See Note 2, p. 19.

Amongst other minor objections, it is difficult to see how any 'combination' of i. 46 and ii. 1 could possibly produce the statement that Nathanael belonged to Cana. In the former chapter, we are not told whence he came; in the latter, merely that Jesus, His mother, and His disciples attended a marriage there.

Prof. Schmiedel here lays great stress upon what he thinks is the special *motif* of this chapter; it is "to bring the dignity of Peter into somewhat greater prominence than it had received in the [preceding] Gospel." He allows, however, that "the unnamed disciple [John himself] is always placed even higher than he"; but adds, "the purpose of rehabilitating Peter is plain."

But Peter's offence had been recorded in a very lenient manner by the author of this Gospel, and the Synoptists had dwelt upon his repentance, Luke adding an Appearance of Jesus to him. 'Rehabilitation,' therefore, was hardly necessary. Furthermore, a writer who wished thus to exalt Peter, would scarcely have been content with leaving him in a position of inferiority to the unnamed disciple, and would also have probably alluded more definitely to the latter. The original author too may — on subsequent consideration — have thought that he had previously rather overlooked Peter, and added this record, even at the risk of disturbing his carefully arranged trio of Appearances. We really cannot definitely settle

these matters, owing to the imperfection of our information.

But Prof. Schmiedel has a further, and, in our view, less plausible, theory regarding the purpose of this chapter. In John xxi. 13, we have, he says, "a reminiscence of a celebration of the Lord's Supper," which latter, in John, "has its prototype in the feeding of the five thousand with loaves and fishes (vi. 9, 11 = xx. 9), which, however, in turn, bears the most express marks of being but a clothing of the Supper."

Again, he explains, "the number 7, as applied to the disciples [present on this occasion], corresponds to the number of baskets which, in the second 'feeding' in the Synoptists (Mark viii. 8 = Matt. xv. 37), were filled with the fragments that remained over; whilst in John vi. 13, in agreement with the first 'feeding' in the Synoptists (Mark vi. 43 = Matt. xiv. 20 = Luke ix. 17), twelve baskets are filled, corresponding to the number 12 as applied to the disciples." Further, "the mysterious character of the risen Jesus at the Supper appears . . . at the Sea of Galilee in no one's asking who he was (John xxi. 12)."

This kind of scriptural exegesis and juggling with numerical statements is something quite different from the author's use of the 'perfect' numbers 3 and 7, and comes perilously near to the Midrash of the Rabbins. We have a further instance of this unsatisfactory mode of treatment in the speculations

of some critics as to the origin and meaning of the number of fishes—153—which are stated to have been caught on this occasion. With the exception of those possessed of tendencies to Gnosticism, such speculations and fanciful constructions found but little favour with the early Christians, and we cannot deem it probable even that the writer of this chapter had any such cryptic meaning in his mind when he penned it. It may, or may not, relate an historic fact; but in any case it does not seem to carry any occult or mystical sense.

Indeed, we are specially told[1] that the Apostles—and, we might add, the early Christians generally—were 'unlearned and ignorant men,' *i.e.* not skilled in rabbinic lore, and methods of exegesis. Consequently, it is not likely that such methods of conveying teaching were used by this writer.

The Appearance referred to here has no other attestation in Canonical literature. In the *Gospel according to Peter*,[2] however, the fragment we possess ends with these words: "Now it was the last day of unleavened bread,[3] and many were going forth, returning to their homes, as the feast was ended. And we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, mourned and were grieved: and each one, being grieved for that which was come to pass, departed to his home.[4]

[1] Acts iv. 13. [2] See Appendix A. [3] The feast lasted a week.

[4] This statement—if trustworthy—would appear to contravene Prof. Schmiedel's theory that the disciples fled straight from Gethsemane to Galilee. Only three are mentioned by name, but the *Twelve* are here represented as remaining in Jerusalem till *after* "the last day of unleavened bread." And this work, in general, supports the Tradition of Galilee!

Now I, Simon Peter, and Andrew my brother, took our nets and went to the sea; and there was with us Levi, the son of Alphæus, whom the Lord . . ." Here the fragment breaks off; but it is evident that the narrative went on to describe an Appearance by the Lake. So far, this coincides with the Johannine Appendix. But there is (apparently at least) also a serious divergence. In chap. xxi. we are told that *seven* disciples went fishing; in the Gospel of Peter, it would seem that only *three* went (unless the remainder of the passage mentioned others, which does not seem likely).

Again, there is a divergence in the matter of the name. Levi, the son of Alphæus, mentioned in the pseudo-Petrine narrative, is not named amongst the seven given in the Fourth Gospel. Are we, therefore, to infer that these traditions refer to two separate events, whether historical or otherwise? This is not probable. It is in fact reasonable to suppose here that there was a single primitive tradition of *one* Appearance by the Lake; and that these two accounts are variants of this, differing both in the number of the disciples present and in their names, while agreeing in the main point.

As regards the question of preference, although the *Gospel according to Peter* undoubtedly contains very ancient and authentic tradition, the general character of its narrative would cause most critical readers to decide in favour of the version given by the unknown author of the additional chapter to the Fourth Gospel.

CHAPTER VI

THE VISION OF *PAUL* ON THE DAMASCUS ROAD

Acts ix. 3-9; xxii. 6-11; xxvi. 14, 19; 1 Cor. xv. 8

We have no less than three detailed records of this Appearance (or Vision) in the Acts of the Apostles, and a brief corroborative and general statement in the first Letter to the Corinthian Church.

Dealing first of all with the narratives in the Acts, we find that Prof. Schmiedel alleges the following contradictions in them :—

(*a*) According to Acts xxii. 9, Paul's companions see the *light* from heaven, but do not hear the *voice* of Jesus.

(*b*) According to Acts ix. 7, they hear the *voice*, but see no one, and do not fall down.

(*c*) According to Acts xxvi. 12-18, they fall down with Paul, but it is he alone who sees the heavenly light, and hears the voice.

"This last acount, moreover, represents him as having received *at the time* an explanation of what had occurred; according to xxii. 14 f., he did not receive the explanation until *afterwards* through Ananias." [1]

[1] Writing some years after, this might be taken as 'at the time.' See Note, p. 75.

Prof. Schmiedel then proceeds:[1] "It is difficult to imagine how it could ever have been possible for an author to take them [*i.e.* the above three variant accounts] into his book in their present form, not to speak of accepting them in points where they are unsupported by the Epistles of Paul. In these Epistles, there is not the slightest countenance for the belief that Paul heard *words*, although he had the strongest motives for referring to them, had he been in a position to do so. It is upon the *appearance* on the journey to Damascus that he bases his claim to have been called to the apostolate by Jesus himself. The claim was hotly denied by his opponents: it was to his interest, therefore, to bring forward everything that could validly be adduced in its support."

There are, besides the above-named objections, certain other alleged *historical* discrepancies between the Acts and the Pauline Epistles.[2]

1. "The *Acts* (ix. 19) say that Paul after his conversion remained *some days* in Damascus, and forthwith preached Christ in the synagogues there; that when the Jews sought to kill him, he was sent to Jerusalem, where the disciples looked upon him with suspicion, till Barnabas convinced them of his sincerity; that he resumed his work of teaching the Jews till he was again compelled to flee from Jerusalem and return to Tarsus."

[1] § 17 (*g*), iii.

[2] See *An Introduction to the Study of the New Testament*, S. Davidson, D.D., vol. ii. pp. 94 ff., 3rd Edition.

The *Epistle to the Galatians* (i. 17, 18) says that "immediately after his conversion, he went to Arabia, whence he returned to Damascus, and *after three years* went up to Jerusalem."

"The text of the Acts," it is maintained, "does not admit of the insertion of the Arabian journey, even in the 'many days' of ix. 23, because the days refer, according to the context, to *Damascus*, not to that place and Arabia. Still less does it admit of the visit to Arabia being placed before the notice of his active preaching, 'and immediately' (ix. 20); for the direct succession of 'and immediately' to 'some days' in 'Damascus' excludes a journey to Arabia between them. The retirement into Arabia, wherever inserted in the narrative of the Acts—and it has been thrust into various places—proves a refractory incident."

The conclusion sought to be established here is, of course, that Luke did not know of this visit to Arabia.

2. "According to the *Acts*, when Paul came from Damascus to Jerusalem, and the disciples there did not believe that he was a convert (a fact that must have been well-known at the metropolis, if more than three years had elapsed since his conversion), Barnabas brought him *to the Apostles*, with whom he was associated for a time.

"This disagrees with the *Epistle to the Galatians* (i. 18), which states that he went to Jerusalem to see *Peter*, and saw no one else *except James*. Paul's own account excludes *John*, that of the Acts includes

him. Trip himself admits[1] that there is some inexactness here."

As these 'discrepancies' are put forward for the ostensible purpose of proving the Narratives entirely untrustworthy, we will examine them in detail. Let us take first of all the Narratives in the Acts.[2]

In chap. xxii. we have St Paul's own account of the matter, given to the Sanhedrin after his arrest; in chap. ix., Luke's version of it; and in chap. xxvi. St Paul's account as stated to Agrippa. Now in chap. xxii. 9, it is stated that his companions see '*the light*' (τὸ φῶς); in ix. 7, they see '*no one*' (μηδένα), and the light is not mentioned; while in chap. xxvi. 12-18, he merely states that *he* (Paul) saw '*a light*,' which (according to this version), may, or may not, have been seen by the others. We cannot infer from his statement (as Prof. Schmiedel does), that they *did* not see it.

Again, in chap. xxii. 7, Paul states that he heard '*a voice*' (φωνῆς) uttering certain words; in ver. 9 he says that his companions heard not the 'voice' (φωνήν) of him that spake. The Greek noun here translated 'voice' (also = *sound*), it will be observed, is in the former instance in the *genitive*, and in the

[1] *Paulus nach der Apostelgeschichte*, p. 70.

[2] Of the more recent critics, Van Manen (*Handleiding voor de Oudchristelijke Letterkunde*, Leiden, 1900) regards the Acts in general as non-historical and non-Lucan. The portions containing a history of the life of St Paul, he supposes to be derived from a (hypothetical) *Acts of Paul*, which, however, he allows must have contained a redaction of a diary, perhaps by Luke, the companion of Paul. Harnack, however, now thinks the Acts were written by Luke about 80 A.D.

latter in the *accusative* case. This indicates some difference in meaning, which it is somewhat difficult to bring out in the less exact English. But it is just possible to take φωνῆς as a kind of partitive genitive, and regard it as referring to a *part only* of what the voice gave utterance to, *i.e.* the *sound*—the actual *words* as well as the *sound* being expressed by the accusative (φωνήν). We might, therefore, render the Greek here—ἤκουσα φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι, Σαούλ, κ.τ.λ.—'I heard the *sound-of-a-voice*, saying to me, "Saul,"' etc.—the latter part of the sentence being added as explanatory of what the communication was, which is not conveyed by the genitive alone.[1] In ver. 9, he says, τὴν δὲ φωνὴν οὐκ ἤκουσαν τοῦ λαλουντός μοι—'But they [his companions] did not hear the *words-of-the-voice* of him that spake to me.' Similarly, in ix. 4, it says, ἤκουσεν φωνὴν λέγουσαν αὐτῷ, Σαούλ, κ.τ.λ.—'He heard the *words-of-a-voice* saying to him, "Saul,"' etc. And in ver. 7, ἀκούοντες μὲν τῆς φωνῆς, μηδένα δὲ θεωροῦντες.—'Hearing the *sound-of-the-voice*, but seeing no one.' Again, xxvi. 14, we have, ἤκουσα φωνὴν, λέγουσαν πρός με τῇ Ἑβραΐδι διαλέκτῳ, Σαούλ, κ.τ.λ.—'I heard the *words-of-a-voice*, saying to me in the Hebrew tongue, "Saul,"' etc.

We have no desire to strain the Narrative here by forcing upon it any artificial interpretation, but the author's use of these two cases seems to be

[1] What the *words* were he may have realized subsequently. This is a not uncommon experience. The meaning *develops*, as it were, afterwards.

guided by some intention to express a difference in meaning. Upon this hypothesis we might expect φωνήν (instead of φωνῆς) in xxii. 7; but the explanatory λεγούσης μοι (saying to me), introduces the words that give the interpretation of the sound, which may be wanting in the genitive alone. In any case some such distinction as this is evidently implied by the consistent use of the two cases in two out of the three accounts. We may add also that such refinements of meaning are thoroughly characteristic of the Greek language, at least of its classical form.

Let us now sum up our results :—

(1) The *light*. In (*a*) it is *implied* that Paul saw it, and *stated* that his companions did. In (*b*) it is *implied* that both he and *they* saw it, but they saw no-one, while *he* saw Jesus. In (*c*) it is *stated* that he saw it, and *not stated* (or implied) that they did not.

(2) The *voice*. In (*a*) he heard the *sound-of-a-voice* (possibly indistinct at first, but later as) uttering certain words, whilst they hear merely the *sound*.[1] In (*b*) he hears the *words-of-a voice*; while they hear the *sound* only. In (*c*) he hears the *words-of-a-voice*; whether his companions hear anything at all is not stated, but it may perhaps be inferred that they heard a *sound*, as before.

Similarly with regard to the question of their

[1] *Cp.* John xii. 29.

falling to the earth: In (*a*) *he* falls down; but whether *they* do or not is not stated. In (*b*) *he* falls but *they* 'stood speechless' (ἱστήκεισαν ἐνεοί). This, of course, may mean that they literally remained standing. But the intransitive tenses of ἵστημι are often merely a stronger form of εἶναι (to be); and therefore it might at least, with equal probability, be translated, '*they remained there* (*i.e.* on the ground) speechless,' the falling down being obviously implied. In (*c*) both *he* and *they* are *said* to fall down.

It will be seen, therefore, from a careful consideration of the analysis we have made, that there is no serious contradiction, or discrepancy, whatever on any of these points in the three accounts; but, on the contrary, a general unanimity.[1]

Let us turn now to the alleged *historical* discrepancies.

1. It must be premised that the narrative in the Acts is *Luke's* version of the matter, which is based upon information obtained from various sources, principally, no doubt, St Paul himself. The statement in *Galatians*, on the other hand, is St Paul's own recollection of the affair.

Now, it is quite possible—indeed likely—that

[1] It may be also added that in xxii. Ananias is represented rather as endeavouring to rouse Paul, perhaps from a state of lethargy following upon his vision, and urging him to be baptized, etc., than as *explaining* to him what had occurred and its meaning, as the Voice does in xxvi. Thus the *nature* of the communication is quite different, and there is no contradiction here.

Luke's version would contain *some* inaccuracy in detail, and be, in general, inferior in point of value to that of St Paul.

But the latter might remain 'some days' in Damascus, and still be said (in his own language) to go 'immediately' elsewhere: in other words, he did not make a permanent stay there. The original, however, does not say that he 'went away immediately'; but that he did not *immediately confer with flesh and blood*,[1] *i.e.* the other Christians. The wording is perhaps somewhat clumsy and obscure, but it does not in any case preclude his having stayed 'some days' in Damascus, and probably means that during the time he lived in some retirement in the midst of the Christian community in that city.

The omission of the journey to Arabia is certainly a 'discrepancy'; but it may be accounted for, either by supposing that Luke's information on that point was defective, or that, as it was probably in the nature of a retirement for meditation, etc., Luke did not deem it necessary to mention it in his history.

The going-up to Jerusalem thereafter, which is stated in the *Acts* to have been 'after *many days* were fulfilled,' and in *Galatians* to have been 'after *three years*,' are not necessarily contradictory. The former is a vague term, and *might* mean several years. And the Arabian visit can very well be placed between vers. 22 and 23, as there is a distinct break of some

[1] The adverb (*εὐθέως*) is in the same clause with 'conferred,' and *not* with 'went away.' This gives quite a different meaning.

length of time implied in the latter verse. St Paul, too, may very probably, in that case, have returned to Damascus before going up to Jerusalem. Luke does not *say* so; but his narrative is compressed, and somewhat defective from the point of view of detail, and hence this explanation is more than probable. It is unlikely that Luke was *absolutely* ignorant of the visit to Arabia; but he may well not have known *exactly* when it took place.

2. The second 'discrepancy' is largely created by a misunderstanding of the word 'believed' (πιστεύοντες). The narrative does not say that the Christians were *unacquainted* with the fact that he professed to be a disciple; but that they *mistrusted* the genuineness of his professions (πάντες ἐφοβοῦντο αὐτόν—'all feared him')—a widely different matter. They must, of course, have *known* that he had been a professed Christian for some time; they might perhaps be pardoned for doubting whether the zealous ex-persecutor could be *relied* on. Here, again, therefore, when we come to analyse the narrative carefully, we do not find the disagreement which is stated to exist.

One more point remains: Luke says that when Paul went to Jerusalem, 'Barnabas took him and brought him to the Apostles'; St Paul himself says that he 'saw only Peter and James, the brother of the Lord.' These statements are not contradictory. James was the official head of the Church at Jerusalem, and, therefore, the *representative* Apostle. Paul

would, therefore, probably interview him in his official capacity as representative of the 'Apostolic College'; while Peter's interview was possibly a purely personal one. The other Apostles, however, no doubt, felt mistrust, and gave him no recognition personally till they were reassured. There is nothing inconsistent in this.

We have now to deal with another question, termed by Prof. Schmiedel the 'Situation of Paul.'[1] That is, in other words, to ask what was the *cause* and *meaning* of this Vision of his? Prof. Schmiedel gives us *ten* reasons for supposing that it was a perfectly natural phenomenon, easily accounted for by certain indisputable facts.

These facts are:—

(*a*) He had been a persecutor.

(*b*) He had heard the passages of the Old Testament the disciples quoted to establish the Messiahship of Jesus.

(*c*) He knew the sort of *form* (*i.e.* vision) in which the disciples had seen Jesus.

(*d*) He recognized their honesty, seriousness, and blameless characters, and pitied their sufferings.

(*e*) He felt no sense of self-satisfaction with the cruel course of action he was pursuing.

(*f*) He knew that God had promised a time of salvation; and this could not be through the Law, for to fulfil that was clearly impossible.

(*g*) Therefore, it *might* be that after all it was

[1] § 35.

through Jesus that all this could be accomplished; in which case His death was a crime.

(*h*) As a Pharisee, too, he must have felt that *some* kind of propitiation was necessary before God could bring His grace to operate. And perhaps the Christians had begun already to quote Isa. liii.

(*i*) There was the question as to whether Jesus were not really risen; if so, then He did not die as a criminal (his first thought), but as a divine offering for sin.

(*k*) The vividness with which he—who was *prone* to visions—pictured to himself the living figure of the (perhaps) risen Jesus.[1]

From a consideration of all these various alleged operating causes—granting, for argument's sake, that they were all at work in the case of St Paul—it does not seem that any one, or even all of them taken together, could have caused the stupendous change which the Vision on the Damascus road is stated to have produced, and undoubtedly did produce, in the mind of the Apostle. Even if we granted that they might cause a purely subjective hallucination of a risen Jesus, we are very far from explaining the spiritual import of the phenomenon. For we

[1] The whole negative-critical position with regard to Paul is, that when he went to Damascus, he was unconsciously resisting a growing conviction that Jesus after all *was* the Messiah, and that through an attack of a peculiar nervous malady, to which he was subject, stubborn resistance was suddenly changed into whole-hearted adherence to Christianity. See especially Meyer's *Wer hat das Christentum begründet, Jesus oder Paulus*, Tübingen.

have, *inter alia*, also certain *objective* facts to take into consideration. We have seen that in more than one account the *light* and the *voice* were seen and heard by his companions—probably a somewhat numerous company—who travelled with him to Damascus. To explain away this fact, we must either boldly deny the entire historicity of these narratives (and their brief corroboration in 1 Cor.), or else dismiss the phenomena as collective hallucinations. But both these are desperate expedients; the former is opposed to all the evidence; the latter would lay all our experiences open to doubt. Had Paul *alone* been affected by the light and the voice, then we might admit hallucination, but not in a case where all had the same or similar experiences. Why should a band of men of many temperaments, and perhaps but little connection of any kind with one another, be all suddenly seized with an extraordinary and unlikely hallucination? All experience very similar phenomena—the articulate words only being wanting to the majority. It is incredible. Where collective hallucinations occur, the conditions are always different: there is usually a close bond of some kind amongst those who experience them, a psychological link more binding than a common desire to persecute. The event described is, no doubt, at present inexplicable scientifically; it is, no doubt, 'supernatural' (or, perhaps better, *supernormal*) both in its alleged origin and its manifestation. But this may be due merely to our

ignorance of the higher and more spiritual phenomena of the Universe. We cannot dismiss offhand, or refuse to consider, everything, simply because we cannot fit it into our present (perhaps) materialistic world-formula.

Further objection is taken by Prof. Schmiedel,[1] based upon the somewhat meagre reference to the matter in 1 Cor. xv., that Paul "does not *describe* the appearance." What description could a man give who—it is stated—was blinded by some dazzling light, hurled, so to speak, suddenly to the ground, while a mysterious voice without, as it seemed, exclaimed in reproachful accents, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" The matter may be stated, as it has been, but to *describe* it would be impossible. We are not left to inference merely: the light, the shock, the words, the vision—all these, except the last named, experienced in some degree by the others, admit of no further 'description.'

Prof. Schmiedel, it is true, does not suggest a sunstroke—or epilepsy—as some critics have done. And this with good reason: the sunstricken, or epileptic, do not experience *definite* sense-impressions such as these; neither do they remember the events of that period. It is one of after-oblivion, not, as in St Paul's case, one of after-recollection in almost minute particulars.[2]

[1] § 14.

[2] Pfleiderer (*Gifford Lectures*, pp. 112, 149) would explain Paul's vision as due to a species of epileptic seizure. Epileptics, however, never remember what passes during the spasm and subsequent unconsciousness.

We have already noticed that Prof. Schmiedel remarks it is nowhere stated in the Epistles that St Paul heard *words*, but only that he was 'called' to the apostolate by Jesus Himself. "In pressing this latter fact, 'Am I not an apostle?'[1] he assuredly would not have stopped short at the question, 'Have I not *seen* Jesus, our Lord?' had he been in a position to go on and ask, 'Has he not *named* me his apostle?'" But how could St Paul suppose that he was *called* to the apostolate in such a case? How could a mere Appearance call him to anything—a mere subjective vision, as Prof. Schmiedel would term it? It is true that in the very brief references in the Epistles to his 'call,' St Paul does not *say* that he heard words. But surely he none the less *implies* this, for the above reason. There was a party in the Church of Corinth who rejected his apostleship; but would this party have been in any degree more convinced, or conciliated, if he had added, 'I have heard Jesus call me?' The probability is that the party in question rejected the whole vision as a mere *phantasma* of his imagination, thereby anticipating many modern critics. It may be strange, looking at the matter from our modern standpoint, that he did not go into further detail about this call, when urging his claims to be recognized as an Apostle. But, at the same time, we question whether any mere statement that he had heard words definitely appointing him would have convinced these people.

[1] 1 Cor. ix. 1.

Do not people often *imagine* that they hear words, as well as see persons in dreams and visions? And why should not such words be a part of the hallucination? There is no doubt whatever, that the quick-witted and sceptically disposed Greek of Corinth, who denied not only Paul's call to the apostolate, but even the very possibility of a bodily resurrection, would have argued thus. And possibly St Paul thought that anything more than a brief statement of his claim would be mere waste of words, that it would but lead to those useless *logomachies* in which the Greek converts, the precursors of the later Gnostics, delighted. We, of course, do not know his reason for silence; but we have no right to assume that *because* he mentions no words, he heard none.

The vision, it seems to us, would be perfectly meaningless and inoperative without words, whether actual or imaginary; and neither St Paul, nor anyone else, would have deduced therefrom a call to a position of such great and momentous responsibility, unless he had heard (or thought he had heard) words to that effect. It is, indeed, for Prof. Schmiedel and his school of critics to explain how he came to read the call itself into the vision—subjective vision—of the risen Jesus.

The attempt of Steck[1] to make out that by his use of the term 'make known' (γνωρίζω, 1 Cor. xv.), St Paul intends to show that he is making a state-

[1] *Galater-br.*, 1888, pp. 180-91, *i.e.* 2nd Cent., to which he assigns 1 Cor. Cp. xii. 3, and Gal. i. 11.

ment which, at the time of his making it, was unknown to them, is rightly rejected by Schmiedel. A man can, as he observes, say, even of a thing already well known—'I make it known to you,' *i.e.* 'I would have you bear in mind.'

Finally, we have various other references to this vision. In Gal. i. 16, St Paul uses the expression 'to reveal his Son in me' (ἐν ἐμοί). This has been taken by some critics to mean that St Paul looked upon the revelation near Damascus as one that had taken place solely within himself, *i.e.* something 'subjective,' to employ modern phraseology. But this theory is negatived, as Schmiedel allows, by the use of the emphatic words, 'I have seen' (ἑόρακα), and 'was seen' (ὤφθη) of 1 Cor. ix. 1 and xv. 8. By the use of these, "the Apostle means to say that he has *really* seen (although not in earthly, but in heavenly corporeality) the risen Jesus as appearing to him *ab extra*." [1] This is excellently put, and we could not possibly improve upon the statement. And when he goes on to add, "neither is it probable that 'to reveal' (ἀποκαλύψαι) denotes a subsequent inward illumination of Paul, since 'but when' (ὅτε δέ), and 'straightway' (εὐθέως), mark the time which followed upon that of 'the Jews' religion' (Ἰουδαϊσμός)," we must entirely agree with his statement of the matter.[2]

To conclude, therefore, we may add that the *reality*, the objective reality of St Paul's experiences

[1] § 35 (*l*).

[2] See Gal. i. 12-14.

near Damascus is vouched for by a strong line of first-hand evidence, corroborated, in all essential particulars, by the secondary testimony of Luke. And the mere fact that St Paul himself does not detail the event in the manner and words of Luke is mere negative evidence of the very weakest type. The whole tenor of St Paul's subsequent life and character is explicable only upon the presumption that he both *saw* a vision of the risen Jesus, and *heard* from His own lips the commission to be 'a minister and a witness both of the things which he had seen, and of those things in the which he would appear unto him.' [1]

As regards the nature of this Objective Vision, we will reserve its consideration for another chapter.[2]

[1] It is worth noting that, according to Steinmeyer (*The Passion and Resurrection History*, p. 325), even such a radical critic as "Baur at the close of his life-work, and to the annoyance of many, expressed the opinion that no analysis, either psychological or dialectical, explains the conversion of Paul, and that the enigma does not admit of a solution, *unless we acknowledge a miracle.*"

[2] See chap. ix.

CHAPTER VII

ST PAUL'S LIST OF APPEARANCES, AND THE GOSPEL RECORDS

In any consideration of the Pauline list of Manifestations of Jesus, "the main question," according to Prof. Schmiedel, "will be whether or not Paul omitted any accounts of the resurrection of Jesus which were known to him." [1] We will, therefore, before considering his position and arguments on this point, throw into a comparative table St Paul's list, and those Appearances recorded in the Gospels and Acts. We then get the following results :—

St Paul's List (1 Cor. xv.).	*List from Gospels and Acts.*
——————[2]	(1) The Women (Matt.).[3]
——————[2]	(2) Mary Magdalene ([Mark][3] John).
1. Cephas (Peter).	(3) Peter (Luke).
——————	(4) The Two Disciples (Luke).
2. The "Twelve."	(5) The Ten (Luke, John [Mark]).
——————	(6) The Eleven (John).
——————	(7) The Seven at the Lake [John].[3]
(?)	(8) The Eleven in Galilee, and the Five
3. The Five Hundred.	Hundred (?) (Matt.).
4. James.[3]	——————
5. The Eleven	(9) The Eleven near Jerusalem (Luke, Acts).
6. Paul.	(10) Paul (Acts).

[1] § 12.

[2] St Paul's omission of the Appearances to the Women is regarded by Steck (quoted by Schmiedel) as an 'artificial touch.' Steck regards it as certainly historical that the first news of the Resurrection was brought by women.

[3] (1) Also Didasc. and Copt. Narr.; (2) Didasc. and Copt. Narr.; (7) Gosp. of Peter; 4 Gospel acc. to Hebrews.

In summing-up the above table, we find that (excluding the last-mentioned Appearance to Paul himself), out of *nine* Manifestations recorded in the Gospels and Acts, St Paul mentions only *five*;[1] thus he omits four which are narrated by the other authorities conjointly.[2]

Now there are only two possible explanations of this fact, viz., either :—

1. He was not acquainted with these four when he wrote, or
2. That he knew of them, but omitted them here for some reason or other.

1. This is practically the view taken by Prof. Schmiedel. He argues that *because* St Paul does not mention these four, he knew nothing of them. And the further inference which he draws from this conclusion is, that they were invented, or grew up in a legendary fashion *after* St Paul penned this chapter.[3] His arguments in support of this conclusion may be thus summed-up :—

(*a*) The whole truth of Christianity rested upon the Resurrection.

(*b*) He knew by experience the inclination to disbelieve in that event, and, therefore, that

[1] Possibly *six*, it being doubtful whether the Appearance to the Eleven and the Five Hundred are to be counted as *one* or *two*.

[2] It will be convenient here to state the probable (approximate) dates for these books, which are assumed in this work: 1 Cor., 52-55 A.D.; Mark, 65-68; Matthew, 70-72; Luke, 80-85; Acts, 85-90; John, 90-95.

[3] § 12. Schmiedel accepts 1 Cor. as a genuine work of Paul. This is only denied by Van Manen and a few Dutch critics.

every Manifestation of the risen Christ was of great importance as evidence of the fact.

(*c*) During his visit to Jerusalem, he had the best opportunities to obtain full knowledge of all these from Peter and James.

(*d*) In Corinth, especially, the Resurrection was entirely disputed, and, therefore, he would naturally quote every proof of it he knew of.

(*e*) His manner of detailing his list, εἶτα . . . ἔπειτα . . . ἔπειτα . . . εἶτα . . . ἔσχατον . . . guarantees strict chronological order *and* completeness.

Now, it is a mere truism to say that the whole fabric of Christianity then—just as now—rested upon the Resurrection of Jesus.[1] Indeed, it would be no exaggeration to say that this doctrine was the better half of the Primitive Gospel. The Apostles proclaimed everywhere they went, that 'Christ both died for our sins, *and* rose again for our justification,' the latter being really the great climax and guarantee of the sacrificial act, without which the sacrifice would be entirely ineffectual. It is, however, not quite equally true to say that St Paul laboured under difficulties, which perhaps particularly affected the Greek-Christian of Corinth.

St Paul was a Jew by birth, and, accordingly, to a certain extent at least, viewed the world from the standpoint and prejudices of the Jew. He could, therefore, accept both the doctrine of a *vicarious*

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 14.

sacrifice, and (in a certain limited sense) that of a *bodily* resurrection. Both of these doctrines were to the Gentile Greek "foolishness." All that came naturally within the mental horizon of the Greek mind was a dim and shadowy immortality.

To the Greek, the other world was a region of ghostly shades flitting about in perpetual disquietude, not a place of re-embodied spirits rejoicing in the presence of God in 'glorified' and exalted organisms. St Paul's great difficulty, on the contrary, was to realize that Jesus of Nazareth, a crucified malefactor, a false Messiah, rejected alike by Priests and Scribes learned in the Law, could in any sense have fulfilled the hopes and aspirations of the Jew. God, he thought, could not possibly have raised such an one forthwith from the dead, even though He perhaps *might* do so at the general Resurrection, in common with others both bad and good. In other words, St Paul's difficulty was not with the Resurrection itself, but with the special and immediate Resurrection of Jesus Christ, and its value as part of a divine scheme. This is a very different thing, and wholly unlike the objections of the Corinthian Greek. The current Jewish conceptions of a resurrection were, it is true, materialistic;[1] but St Paul soon learned to rise above these, and teach a doctrine which is neither materialistic nor spiritualistic, but both combined in a highly refined and elevated form.

[1] See Appendix D.

Again, it is true that he had probably every opportunity, during his visit to Jerusalem, of knowing of all the duly accredited Appearances of Jesus. We can well suppose that he must have heard these mentioned at various times by the Apostles with whom he conversed. It is improbable, however, that he was furnished with anything like a written list, recorded in exact chronological sequence, or that the Church at Jerusalem kept any such list. It is more than doubtful, in fact, whether at that time any Christian documents, other than collections of *Logia*, existed.

No list of a formal character would, therefore, be drawn up, and the information which St Paul derived from the Apostles at Jerusalem would certainly be more of an informal and incidental character, than a regular catalogue of the Appearances of the Lord. Prof. Schmiedel refers here to "a fixed number of appearances, which, according to xv. 11, he was in the habit of bringing forward everywhere, in agreement with the original apostles, in his preaching of the resurrection of Jesus." There is not a shadow of evidence to prove that such a list ever existed, and 1 Cor. xv. 11 has no such meaning. It merely refers generally to the fact that both he and the Apostles preached the Resurrection as the cardinal article of the Christian faith.

Further, the difficulty with regard to the Resurrection which was felt at Corinth was a *fundamental* one (as we have shown above), and, therefore, a

difficulty which was not to be removed by any mere "piling-up" of recorded Appearances.

Five or six *well-authenticated* instances were as good as a dozen; but any number, however large, and however well-authenticated, did not remove the difficulty. "How can these things be?" would be the answer of the sceptical Corinthian.

And, lastly, his use of the different conjunctive particles cannot have had any such hard and fast meaning of necessity attached to it. Surely, when a man is enumerating any number of events, selected it may be from a larger list, he may be allowed to record them by saying, 'then' . . . 'after that' . . . 'after that' . . . 'then' . . . 'last of all,' without his guaranteeing that his list is absolutely full and complete!

Indeed, the only really *definite* particle is the final one, which certainly implies that the Appearance to St Paul himself was the one which closed the series. There is no *first* one mentioned, and no definite position in the series is fixed for each, except that it came after the preceding one. Moreover, St Paul's list was drawn up at Ephesus,[1] when he was upon his missionary travels, far away from the other Apostles, and from sources of exact information. It is, therefore, almost certain that he quotes the list directly from memory, and not from any documents which he carried with him. Indeed, it is, as above stated, in the highest degree improbable

[1] Some MSS. give Philippi; but this appears to be an error.

that a formal and complete list, guaranteed by Apostolic witness and signature, was ever drawn up. The unsettled conditions of their lives, and the fact that these Appearances were not primarily used as 'evidences,' in the modern sense, all go to show that the Manifestations quoted by St Paul and the Evangelists were obtained from the accounts given by the women and the Apostles, rather in their individual than in their collective and official capacities. And this fact goes largely to account for the extremely fragmentary character of all the records, and the variations in matters of detail which are all throughout characteristic of the Narratives. We may—regarding it from a modern and 'evidential' standpoint—regret this fact; but we cannot alter it; and we must always bear it in mind in all our examinations of the documents which have come down to us.

2. And this leads us up to the second of our two alternatives—that while he must have known, or heard of, other Appearances, St Paul does not chronicle them here. The reasons have been already given — further quotations would not have strengthened his case. Like the instances of the women,[1] they would not have helped to carry con-

[1] See chap. viii. pp. 103 ff. It may be asked here why, if (as is insisted by the negative critic) St Paul knew nothing of the Story of the Empty Tomb, he in his list (1 Cor. xv. 4) lays stress upon the *third* day, and uses the expression 'is *risen*'? A mere visionary appearance might occur at any moment after death; but to emphasize thus the reappearance of Jesus

viction to the Corinthian mind. St Paul, indeed, throughout all his Epistles to the Greek- and Latin-speaking world, never refers to them as *evidences*,[1] but as illustrating (rather than proving) the truth of his position. The great *proof* of Christianity after all was—then as well as now—not the frequency, or even the *fact* of the Manifestations of Christ, but its divine power over the human mind and spirit and the divine *energy*, which it supplied to man in his struggle with the forces of evil, and the hope with which it inspired him of a better and more complete existence hereafter. And no mere lengthy or complete catalogue could add aught to that.

We may conclude, therefore, that St Paul's list, so far from being a complete one, was rather in the nature of a rough and ready summary of what he looked upon as so many facts, testified to by eye-witnesses of unimpeachable character. That such a striking episode as the Emmaus Appearance should be omitted is no great cause of wonder. The two disciples, though probably well-known members of the Church in Jerusalem, were not men of the first rank in the Early Church. It was *to the witness of the Twelve*, both collectively and individually, that men looked in St Paul's day. Such an Appearance,

on the *third* day, and speak of Him as *raised*, is to refer indirectly to a body and spirit re-united at some fixed time, and the emptying of the tomb of its previous dead occupant. Otherwise these expressions are meaningless.

[1] If he had regarded them as *evidential*, he would have referred to them elsewhere.

therefore, however interesting as a psychological study and circumstantial narrative, would add practically no weight to the 'evidence' of the others as records of fact.

We have finally to consider the question of the priority of the Pauline list, as compared with the records—there is no *list*—in the Gospels. Steck thinks [1] that the instances in which 1 Cor. xv. agrees with the Gospels are drawn by both from a common source. This is probable, in the sense that the source was unwritten; [2] but his further conjecture that the Appearance to the Five Hundred is a modified version of what happened at Pentecost (Acts ii.) is most improbable. The two accounts are, as Prof. Schmiedel remarks, totally different. The difficulty, however, which leads to such exegesis as this, is that of applying to five hundred men assembled together the vision-hypothesis.

This theory is difficult enough in the case of twelve persons; it is perfectly inconceivable with much larger numbers.

Prof. Schmiedel remarks that "the freedom from legendary features" is one of the strongest arguments in favour of the priority of St Paul's list. This list, however, is but a meagre and partial catalogue, as we have endeavoured to show. Its claim to priority will rest rather upon the fact that 1 Cor. xv. is undoubtedly an older document than any of our present

[1] *Galater-br.* pp. 180 ff.

[2] Many critics, however, think that there was a very early written record.

Gospel Narratives, by some twelve (or more) years.[1] The only real difficulty which presents itself in this connection is the reason for all the Gospel accounts overlooking any of the Manifestations recorded by St Paul, *e.g.* the Appearance to James. Prof. Schmiedel's explanation[2] of this omission is, that when instances of Jesus partaking of food, or speaking, etc., had begun to be quoted, mere Appearances would hardly any longer possess much interest. But, if this be the reason, why—we may ask—do the Gospels retain that to Peter?

Further, in cases of subjective hallucination, it is just as common to hear voices as to see human forms, and the sight of Jesus eating was also a visual phenomenon.

For a really satisfactory explanation, we must revert once more to a theory of selection. Each Evangelist selects what he deems most edifying and suitable to his purpose. The question of privacy too has probably to be considered: Appearances to Peter and James, the Lord's brother, might well be connected with matters of great personal import, but of little interest, or importance, to the Church at large. Had the appetite for marvels been as largely developed as Prof. Schmiedel assumes, we should have had a larger supply of them to meet it.

That the first Christians, however, did not approach

[1] It must be remembered also that 1 Cor. xv. 5 really takes us back to a period "which was separated by only *four years* from the great events of the death and resurrection of Jesus."

[2] § 23 (*e*). See Keim, *Jesus of Nazara*, vol. vi. p. 279.

the matter in this spirit is obvious to every thoughtful reader. Such highly seasoned narratives of the marvellous are rather met with amongst overcivilized and decadent societies, where there is an entire lack of the serious and truly religious spirit. Isolated cases of hallucination, of course, will occur everywhere; but a wholesale manufacture of legend is foreign to the whole tendency of a religious society in its primitive and purer stages.

CHAPTER VIII

THE EMPTY TOMB

All the four Gospels uniformly assert that the body of Jesus after death was placed in a new rock-tomb (Mark omits 'new'), which was closed with a large stone[1] (*gôlal*), and belonged to the well-to-do Joseph of Arimathæa. The vast majority of critics have unreservedly accepted this probable statement as historical. A very small minority, however, headed by Strauss[2] and Volkmar,[3] have rejected it.

The latter believes that the body of Jesus, like those of most executed criminals, was left unburied, or possibly thrown into some hole and covered with earth. That this additional insult was inflicted he thinks is "unquestionable." Even St Paul's reference

[1] As a protection against both men and beasts. This stone is often mentioned by the Talmudists. According to Maimonides, a structure *ex ligno, alia materia* was also used. It usually required several men to remove it.

[2] *New Life of Jesus* (E. Tr.), i. pp. 396, 431; ii. p. 395.

[3] *Rel. Jes.* pp. 77 ff.; *Evang.* p. 603; *Marc. u. d. Syn.* p. 603. Isa. liii. 9; xxii. 16-18, and Rev. xi. 8 f. are cited as authorities; but it is difficult to see in what way they can have influenced the narrative. The references in Isaiah (if Messianic) certainly suggest burial in the ordinary way; those in Revelation, while probably referring to Jerusalem ("the Great City," *Sibyll. Orac.* v. 154, 226, 413), by their plural form evidently do not refer to any individual, but generally to the Zealot *régime* (68-70 A.D.). The 'three days and a half' are also inapplicable, since Jesus was less than three days there.

to its burial he would have to mean only a criminal's grave.

This criticism, however, is summarily rejected by Prof. Schmiedel, who rightly quotes 1 Cor. xv. 4 as historically conclusive.[1] Such speculations, indeed, serve to show to what absurd lengths a certain type of criticism, when unchecked by considerations of evidence and probability, can go.

Another feature in the Gospel narrative, which has been the cause of much improbable speculation, is the period of time during which the body of Jesus is said to have lain in the tomb. It will be remembered that Jesus Himself had predicted His own death and subsequent 'rising again' *after three days*.[2] The Synoptists are all unanimous even in the minutest details upon this point, and the prediction belongs (whatever the negative critics may say to the contrary) to the very earliest and most authentic tradition.

Prof. Schmiedel says[3] with regard to this, "it is not probable that Jesus foretold simply his resurrection; that took him into heaven, whereas the work of the Messiah lay upon earth." The Resurrection of Jesus, however, did not necessarily take Him into heaven, immediately at all events; neither did the work of the Messiah (according to the view He took of it) concern itself entirely, or even chiefly,

[1] Cp. also Acts xiii. 29; Rom. vi. 4; Jos. *B.J.* iv. 5 (2); iv. 6 (3); *Ant.* iv. 8 (6); also Talmud, *Tract. Sanh.* iv. 5, etc.

[2] Matt. xvi. 21; Mark viii. 23; Luke ix. 22. [3] § 22 (a).

with the earth. This latter concept was merely the current Jewish idea, which Jesus emphatically repudiated.[1]

Prof. Schmiedel, it is true, subsequently admits (b), " it must nevertheless be recognized that he may very well, at one time or another, have expressed himself in some such sense."

With regard to the expression ' after three days,' Prof. Schmiedel is of opinion that its determination by Jesus (or subsequently by others), was influenced by certain texts,[2] with which He was familiar.

Another determining factor was (he thinks) the current Jewish belief that the spirit of the deceased lingered near the body for *three* days only, and then, when through the commencement of decomposition it saw its return was hopeless, it betook itself to Sheôl.[3]

It is, however, in effect to beg the whole question at issue to assert simply that the period during which Jesus remained in the tomb was derived from current notions regarding the dead. Jesus, in many other instances, shows Himself quite independent of popular concepts and popular teaching. It might, with equal

[1] Cp. John xviii. 36 and parallels.

[2] Notably 2 Kings xx. 5 ; Hos. vi. 2 ; Jonah i. 17, which he thinks Paul had in his mind when writing 1 Cor. xv. 4. This is, of course, another way of saying the *idea* was borrowed from them. But there is no proof of this, and there are many other ' sacred ' numbers—7, 40, etc.—which would have suggested a greater miracle to the mind of an inventor.

[3] Lightfoot, *Hor. Hebr.*, and Wettstein, both on John xi. 39. Also see *Rest of the Words of Baruch*, Greek text (Harris), ix. 7-13, and in Æthiop. text (Dillmann, *Chrest. Aeth.*). Cp. also case of Lazarus (John xi. 39), where the period of time is exceeded, apparently with deliberate intent.

justice, and perhaps equal probability, be replied that the prescience—divine prescience—of Jesus Himself had foreseen the length of the period, and that these referer ces were really inspired prophetic adumbrations of the event from which possibly the popular conceptions of the post-mortem state were largely derived. Such a time-limit too *may* be a fact, for aught we really know, or can assert, to the contrary. At all events we cannot *assume* that either the prophets, or Jesus Himself, were moved solely by popular concepts in such matters, since they frequently run counter to them on other questions.

In any case, it is evident that the statement ' *after* three days ' is satisfied by the Narratives themselves, in accordance with Jewish mode of speech. These imply that the body lay in the tomb about *thirty-six hours*, distributed over *three successive days*, which corresponds to the expression ' on the third day ' of 2 Kings xx. 5; Hos. vi. 2; but *not* to the statement in Jonah i. 17, where the analogy is only very approximate.[1]

But we now come to the main point at issue in this chapter. Although Prof. Schmiedel allows that the body of Jesus was buried, nevertheless " the accounts

[1] Can Matt. xii. 40 be possibly a gloss? The MSS. evidence would seem to indicate that it is not; but it seems to come in awkwardly in the text, and, moreover, in some ways to be opposed to the Resurrection Narratives. Still, in the Jewish mode of computing time, any portion of a day was popularly and loosely spoken of as the whole. And the portion of time *beyond* a day was spoken of as ' a third day.' Cp. Gen. xl. 13; 1 Sam. xxx. 12; 2 Chron. x. 5. John says (ii. 19-21), ἐν τρισὶν ἡμέραις, ' *within* three days.'

of the empty sepulchre are none of them admissible." [1] His grounds of objection are based upon 'three points':—

1. The silence of Paul, and the rest of the New Testament, except the Gospels.
2. The adverse statement of Mark (xvi. 8).
3. There was no satisfactory examination made of the sepulchre.

We will take these objections in the above order.

(1) "That Paul knew of the empty sepulchre can be maintained only in conjunction with the assumption that for particular reasons he kept silence regarding it." [2]

This is a subtle form of argument. In other words, it implies that St Paul *must* have mentioned the fact (had he known of it) in his brief summary of *Credenda* in 1 Cor. xv. But this is the old argument from omission cropping up again. St Paul is here giving a somewhat compressed summary of what he believes to be the primary articles of the Gospel which he had preached at Corinth. And the whole keynote of this Gospel is, he says, the two facts, (*a*) that Christ died for our sins, and (*b*) that He was buried and rose again the third day—both events happening "according to the Scriptures," *i.e.* the latter foretold them.

Now, if Christ *died*, and was *buried*, and *rose again*, as St Paul here says, then the tomb which He once occupied must *ipso facto* have become empty. It

[1] § 21, referring to 'Gospels'; § 138. [2] § 15.

is perfectly obvious that the subsequent emptiness of the tomb is here indirectly stated by implication, as well as that the reappearance of Jesus was not in the nature of a phantasmal presentation. And, if we may hazard a surmise as to why St Paul did not *say* this directly and at much greater length, the chief reason no doubt was that he supposed this would be taken for granted, when he went on to specify the various Appearances which he recalled to mind as having taken place. A Corinthian Greek would have had no difficulty in appreciating St Paul's meaning here. "Why lay such emphasis on the tomb?" he might have asked, had St Paul dilated upon the subject. "What does *that* prove? The body may have been stolen by the disciples, as the Jews assert; or even removed by the Romans, or the Jews themselves!" No doubt St Paul was quite aware of the probability of such a retort, and so he merely states it indirectly, and then hastens on to the more important facts—the actual Appearances of Jesus.

Again, Prof. Schmiedel asks why the women are not quoted as evidence of this event. He further questions the authenticity of 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35; but even allowing them to be genuine, he says that these words, "are directed only against women speaking in the meeting of the congregation, and merely on grounds of decorum; by no means against their testimony as to a fact; least of all a fact of such importance, and one in regard to which they alone were in a position to give evidence."

These verses, it is true, are merely directed against the practice (which had apparently sprung up in Corinth) of women addressing the congregation at the weekly meetings, and probably they contain no direct rejection of the testimony of women. At the same time we know that in the law courts at Athens, "*women*, minors, and disfranchized citizens were *incompetent to give testimony*." [1] If the experiences and the evidence of women on matters of ordinary daily importance were thus lowly rated—rejected, we may say, with contempt at Athens, in what estimation can they have been held in the more Asiaticized Corinth, especially in regard to extraordinary events? We can well understand that the Corinthian Christians—who were but human (and Greek) after all—would have turned with impatience from such evidence, even though St Paul had insisted that it was of divine appointment, and accordingly pressed it upon them.

Again, Prof. Schmiedel argues "that Jesus was buried, and that '*he has been raised*' (1 Cor. xv. 4) cannot be affirmed by anyone who has not the *reanimation of the body in view*." [2] And, he continues, "when he [Paul] first came to know of Jesus as risen, he was still a Jew, and *therefore* conceived of resurrection at all in no other way than as reanimation of the body." [3]

St Paul's view of the Resurrection, whether that of Jesus on the third day, or that of believers at the

[1] See *A Companion to Greek Studies*, Ed. Whibley, Camb. 1905, p. 398.
[2] § 15 (b). The italics are ours. [3] And, therefore, no phantasm.

general Resurrection—was—at the time of writing his Epistles—certainly *not* the current Jewish idea of a mere 'reanimation of the body.' What he taught was the doctrine of a mysterious but real *transmutation* of the dead body in the case of Jesus, and also of those who were to be alive at the 'last day.' For those who had died, there was not to be a *resuscitation* of the old body, long ago decayed, but the development afresh of *a* body of a new and *spiritual* type, which should bear the same resemblance and relation to their former bodies that Christ's 'glorified' body bore to His body previous to His death and resurrection.

"Behold," he says, "I tell you of a mystery (μυστήριον) . . . we shall all be *changed*, in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trumpet; for the trumpet shall sound, and the dead shall be raised incorruptible (ἄφθαρτοι), and we shall be changed." This is certainly not teaching any mere reanimation, or restoration of the former body. Indeed he, elsewhere,[1] distinctly says the exact contrary. "It (*i.e.* the body) is sown a *natural* body (σῶμα ψυχικόν), it is raised a *spiritual* body (σῶμα πνευματικόν)"—adding parenthetically, "if there is a natural body there is also a spiritual (body)"; that is to say, the existence of the one *implies* the corresponding existence of its correlative, the other. It is therefore an entire misunderstanding of St Paul's meaning and eschatological teaching to suppose that

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 44.

he either taught the doctrine of reanimation, or even held the common Jewish views of the post-mortem state. He had evidently got beyond these, at the time of writing this Epistle.[1] Neither, of course, does he hold to the mere immortality of man, as an unsubstantial εἴδωλον (*phantasm*), as the Greeks did.

(2) Prof. Schmiedel's contention that the women kept complete silence as to their experiences at the tomb has been already dealt with.[2] He adds, however, here, "This failure to carry out the angel's bidding is quite unthinkable, and we readily understand why Matthew and Luke should say the opposite, though this is probably the most violent change they have anywhere made on their exemplar. (The word φόβος in Matt. xxvii. 8, shows that he had before him the ἐφοβοῦντο of Mark.)

"The statement of Mark is intelligible only if we take him to mean that the whole statement as to the empty sepulchre is now being promulgated for the first time by the publication of his Gospel. He cannot intend to say that the women held their peace for a short time

[1] St Paul, it will be remembered, teaches the *tripartite* theory of man's being. The *psychic* (natural) body, the vehicle of the earth-life, is to be ultimately exchanged for the *pneumatic* (spiritual) body, which is not to be subject to decay (ἄφθαρτον), the future vehicle of the heavenly life. Meantime, the spirit (πνεῦμα) remains in this life in a more or less undeveloped and potential condition. The common modern, and deplorably materialistic, teaching on the Resurrection, that *the identical material body* laid in the grave is to be restored, is derived not from St Paul, or indeed the New Testament, but from the crude theories of some of the African Fathers, whose conceptions were still dominated by the crass materialism characteristic of the later Roman mind.

[2] See chap. i. p. 12.

only, for the general belief is that Jesus appeared very soon after His Resurrection, and every delay on the part of the women would have put back the time at which the disciples could arrive in Galilee and behold the promised appearing of the Lord. If Mark is understood in the sense we have indicated, then in him we have a virtual admission, veiled indeed, yet clear, that all statements as to the empty sepulchre were innovations of a later time." [1]

That the women failed to carry out the angel's bidding is, indeed, quite unthinkable, as we have already said. It is entirely contrary to both historical and psychological probability. And since this is so, it is in the highest degree unlikely that Matthew made, or had any need to make, any important change in the statement of Mark, supposing that his narrative is based, directly or indirectly, upon the information contained in that Gospel. They both refer, it is true, to the great fear (φόβος) of the women; and Matthew may, perhaps, to some extent, have 'edited' instead of copying his (written) source of information. But, in any case, the question as to the exact details contained in the original and underlying document is so uncertain that it is unsafe to found any argument upon it.

Further, it is no doubt possible that Mark (if he were the first to write a Gospel), wishes it to be understood that his account is the first record of it laid before the world; but he cannot, and certainly does

[1] § 21 (e).

not, imply that the story had *never been heard of before*. In that case, it would have been necessary for him to have invented it, or else set some one else to do so. If we may take 65 A.D. as the probable date of its publication, it would be monstrous to suppose that a writer of Mark's character, who had been personally acquainted with Peter, and probably others of the "Twelve," and had consorted with St Paul, would deliberately insert in his Gospel a fictitious story, unsupported by any credible testimony, and which, moreover, had never before been heard of during the previous thirty years which had followed the death of Jesus. And even if we might suppose such a thing possible, those of the Apostles who were then alive and acquainted with the facts would have repudiated it. This theory, indeed, is well-nigh impossible, and creates more difficulties than it removes. The women must—after the first revulsion of feeling had passed away—have gone to the disciples, and told them of it, and they too—if evidence is to count for anything, and to be preferred to mere speculation—must have been near at hand; and if there is any 'veiled' meaning at all in Mark's words, it is that the disciples were within a short communicative distance, and not away in Galilee at all. The chief reason, indeed, for placing them in Galilee at that time, is that it is necessary to do so, if Luke's account of the empty tomb is to be dismissed as unhistorical.

(3) Prof. Schmiedel here assumes he has shown that

the supposition that "forthwith on the resurrection day the tidings of the empty sepulchre became known in Jerusalem" is groundless. We think, however, that is just what he has not shown to be even probable. He has not disproved Mark's statement that certain women visited it, and, on his own admission, the theory that they continued to say nothing about what they were told there is so 'unthinkable' that Matthew was constrained to alter it. The probable inference, therefore, is that they went and told some at least of the disciples, who must have been in Jerusalem at the time.

And now the sole point that remains is the *competence* of the witnesses for the emptiness of the tomb. Without doubt, if any of the disciples were in Jerusalem, they would have visited it early on the morning of the *third* day. The prophecies of Jesus, already alluded to, must have recurred to their minds, even if they were temporarily forgotten in the strain and stress of the eventful week. And so, even if we suppose the women to have kept silence, it is not likely that they would have omitted to visit the tomb, some time during the third day, and verify for themselves the truth or falsehood of what they had heard. It is true that the passage in Luke (xxiv. 12), which affirms that one of them did come on the report of the women, is of doubtful authenticity, and that the statement in John (xx. 3-10) that two of them went is later evidence; but both passages reflect a report which is *prima facie* most probable.

Moreover, the stone, according to all the accounts, was rolled away. These various details, incidentally mentioned, suggest indirectly what the Narratives affirm, viz., that the body was gone. And the subsequent story, current among the Jews for many generations, that the disciples had come by night and stolen it, in order to fulfil the prophecies of their Master, also points to the fact that the Jews themselves, from the very first, admitted the ascertained emptiness of the tomb to be a fact.

But Prof. Schmiedel further adds, "only *an examination by opponents* could have claimed greater weight. But it is hardly likely that the tidings reached their ears forthwith. Yet, even had this happened, and the sepulchre been found empty, the fact would have been capable of being explained *by* them as due to a removal of the body." We can easily imagine what would have been the value to us, for example—of an examination of the tomb by, say, a select Committee of the Scribes and Pharisees! And we readily agree with Prof. Schmiedel that one result, amongst others, would have been a report that its emptiness was due simply to a removal of the body. And, indeed, what other report could be expected from men possessed of a violent bias, and most unspiritual minds? There is no need to judge them harshly in this respect; acting up to their lights, the inference would naturally be that the disciples had stolen the body.

The mere empty tomb, indeed, would not of necessity have proved anything. But we have, in addition to this, some ten well-attested Appearances. And the empty tomb, from which neither disciples, Jews, nor Romans had any object whatever in removing a lifeless corpse, taken together with these, is strong circumstantial evidence that Jesus did leave His resting-place under some such conditions as the Gospel narratives plainly state, but do not attempt to describe.

CHAPTER IX

THE SCENE OF THE FIRST APPEARANCES

THE scene of the earlier Manifestations has also been a matter of some controversy. To state the matter succinctly, the views of those critics who admit the fact of the Appearances—whether *objective* or *subjective*—fall into three classes, viz., that they took place:—

(1) In Galilee only;
(2) In Jerusalem only;
(3) First of all in Jerusalem, and later on in Galilee.

The last named is the ordinary view taken by harmonizers of the Narratives.

(1) This theory is, in general, held by critics of the modern negative school, who admit Appearances of a subjective nature. Prof. Schmiedel may be taken as a type, and his arguments and criticisms allowed to stand as expressing the general view. He lays down his position in these words: [1]—

"With reference to the resurrection of Jesus, the most credible statement in the Synoptics [2] is that of

[1] Gospels, § 138 (a). Italics are ours.

[2] It must be remembered that he holds the Johannine narrative, in general, to be unhistorical. Luke, too, he considers of less value historically than Matthew and Mark.

Matthew (and Mark) that the first appearances were in Galilee.[1] . . . *If we leave Mt. xxviii. 9 out of account*, it becomes perfectly clear that no one Gospel from the first reported appearances of the risen Jesus in Galilee as well as in Jerusalem.

"The Gospels, in fact, fall exactly into two classes:—

"1. Mark, Matthew, and the Gospel of Peter are for Galilee;

"2. Luke, John, and Mark xvi. 9-20, for Jerusalem.

"And the *Gospel of the Hebrews* also does not indicate in any way that it looks for James, and Peter, and Peter's companions elsewhere than in the place where it finds the servant of the high priest, viz., Jerusalem.

"It is only afterwards that the writer of John xxi. sees fit to change this 'either, or' into a 'both, and'; so also Matthew, but without admitting an appearance to any male disciples in Jerusalem."

The above statement expresses very fairly and completely the views of those critics who support the "Tradition of Galilee," as expressing the earliest and only credible form of the Narratives. We will examine their position in some detail.

It is obvious to every reader that the first and third Synoptists, as well as the writer of the Fourth Gospel, agree in describing Appearances to the women who visited the sepulchre. The exact position of Mark is doubtful, owing to the loss of the genuine

[1] The Galilean Appearances are emphasized by Tertullian, *Apol.* 21, and Lactantius, *Inst.* iv. 19 f.

ending of his Gospel. As the Gospel stands (omitting vers. 9-20), he does not mention, or clearly imply, an Appearance in Jerusalem.

Judging from the narrative of Matthew, however, it does not seem improbable that the original ending of Mark described a meeting with Jesus, as the women fled from the tomb, just as Matthew does.[1] There is, indeed, only one way of escaping this obvious inference, and that is boldly to deny the authenticity of Matt. xxviii. 9. And this is just what the advocate of this theory does. But there is not the slightest evidence in any of the codices that this verse is an interpolation

There is, it is true, some question as to its exact form,[2] but none as to its genuineness. Indeed, the sole arguments which Prof. Schmiedel brings against vers. 9 and 10 are that:—

(*a*) They contain "nothing more than a repetition of the injunction to the women to bid the disciples repair to Galilee," and

(*b*) They are "absent from Mark, which nevertheless in this section is closely followed by Matthew."

But why should not the injunction be repeated,

[1] Matthew and Mark evidently draw largely from the same sources of information. It is somewhat doubtful, however, which best represents the primitive tradition, though the balance of evidence favours Mark.

[2] Some MSS. insert at the beginning of the verse ὡς δὲ ἐπορεύοντο ἀπαγγεῖλαι τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ ('And as they went to announce [this] to his disciples'). This clause is defended by Griesbach, Fritzsche, Scholz, and Bornemann, but rejected by Mill, Bengel, Gersdorff, Schulz, Rinck, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Meyer, De Wette, and nearly all modern critical editors, including Westcott and Hort.

under certain conditions? The women are described by both Evangelists as terrified; it is, therefore, at least conceivable that, in their terror, they were in danger of overlooking their commission. In fact, Mark practically says as much; that they hurried off intending to say nothing about it, 'for they were afraid.' The absence in Mark of any statement that Jesus met with, and spoke to, them may be (and probably is) due to the fact that the last leaf of the original Mark is lost. If a similar accident had happened to Matthew, we should have had no record of the Appearance and the reiterated injunction there either. In any case this is a sample of the very worst type of modern criticism, that of excising a passage found in all codices simply because it is inconvenient and inconsistent with some preconceived theory of the critic. If once this method of proceeding is admitted, then a narrative can be trimmed and amended according to the fancies and requirements of each individual critic. But this is not criticism in the true sense of the word. And with the retention (by all established rules of textual criticism) of this passage, we have the solid fact to reckon with, that *both Traditions* record an Appearance (accompanied by spoken words) to the women near Jerusalem.

Again, if the view that Galilee was the only scene of the first Appearances is to be maintained, we must get rid of the entire narratives of Luke xxiv. and John xx. This, also, is just what Prof. Schmiedel

and his colleagues propose to do. With one stroke of the pen, regardless of evidence of various kinds, it is all cancelled and struck out as unhistorical—the product of later and legendary growth, invented as time went on to supply the growing demand for marvellous details, and to further the views of the 'anti-Docetic' party, who were predominant in the Church of Jerusalem. That is to say, we have another theory here—that the simple, subjective, and wholly spiritual visions of Galilee were afterwards nearly (but not quite) supplanted by a series of coarser and more material Appearances in Jerusalem. And Prof. Schmiedel seeks for a reason "why the one locality was changed for the other." It is this:[1] "if the disciples had seen Jesus in Jerusalem, as Luke states, it would be absolutely incomprehensible how Mark and Matthew came to require them to repair to Galilee *before they could receive a manifestation of Jesus*. The converse, on the other hand, is very easy to understand—Luke found it inconceivable that the disciples, who, according to him, were still in Jerusalem, should have been unable to see Jesus *until* they went to Galilee. In actual fact, the disciples had already dispersed at Gethsemane (Mark xiv. 50; Matt. xxvi. 56); this Luke *very significantly omits*."

Now this statement is very carefully worded to produce the full effect desired. Let us examine it closely: Mark and Matthew require the disciples

[1] 'Gospels,' § 138 (a). The italics are ours.

to repair to Galilee '*before* they can receive a manifestation of Jesus.' In the original, the women are told simply to convey the intimation that the disciples will see Jesus there. There is nothing whatever said of 'before' or 'after.' 'There shall ye see him' (and, repeated), 'there shall they see me' (Matt.); 'there shall ye see him' (Mark). Luke, therefore, if he had read the first two Synoptics (which is more than probable), did not find in either any statement to the effect that the disciples had been 'unable to see Jesus *until* they went to Galilee.' He merely found it recorded that they *would* see Jesus there—sooner or later.

Furthermore, the whole of this theory hangs upon the 'fact' (? conjecture) that the disciples had gone from Gethsemane to Galilee, a 'veiled indication' of which Prof. Schmiedel finds in Mark. But, if Mark knew, or believed, any such thing, *why did he commission the women who were in Jerusalem to convey a message on the Resurrection morning to the disciples who were in Galilee*? Surely, the mere fact that certain women in Jerusalem, who obviously are not supposed to be going to leave it, should be told to take a message to certain disciples, is rather a 'veiled indication' that the disciples in question were also in (or very near) Jerusalem! At least that is the inference most readers would draw from such a statement. There is, therefore, absolutely *no evidence* whatever to show that the disciples had gone to Galilee, except the imperative need of this

critical theory that they should be out of Jerusalem. Prof. Schmiedel seems really to be aware of this weak spot in the theory, for he admits that a "presupposition is made both by Mark and Matthew that they (the disciples) were still in Jerusalem on the day of the resurrection." But this he quietly dismisses as "erroneous." And he adds that, "it was this error of theirs that led Luke to his still more erroneous inversion of the actual state of the facts." Most people, we think, would maintain that both Mark and Matthew,[1] with their almost firsthand knowledge of the facts, living in the midst of many who remembered the events related, would be less likely to erroneous presuppositions than the twentieth-century critics, whose sources of information are, at the best, but fragmentary, and reach them only after the lapse of so many centuries.

However, it may perhaps be asked, What was the necessity for these Appearances in Galilee, if there were so many previous ones in Jerusalem; why were they not limited to Jerusalem? To this question we fear that it is impossible, with our present knowledge, to give any answer. We do not know; we cannot even surmise why Jesus should appear in Galilee at all. There is, nevertheless, a very ancient tradition that He did do so.[2]

(2) That all the Appearances of Jesus took place in (or near) Jerusalem itself, and not in Galilee, has been

[1] *i.e.* the unknown *author* of Matthew.

[2] Was it for the sake of the Five Hundred?

maintained by a small number of critical scholars, the chief of whom are Loofs, B. Weiss, and Resch.[1]

The first-named scholar thinks that, "those narrators (*i.e.* Mark and Matthew) who represent the whole life of Jesus, with the exception of the last eight days, as having been passed in Galilee, may have transferred to Galilee also the Appearances of the risen Jesus, with regard to which they were very defectively informed; they may have done so all the more easily because the first persons of whom they had occasion to speak in connection with the resurrection were women from Galilee." In other words, the narratives of Appearances of Jesus to His disciples in Galilee are simply the result of a tendency to over-emphasize the Galilean ministry.[2] Matthew, Mark (and Luke) certainly do not *record* any visits of Jesus to Jerusalem at the time of the Passover before the last one at His crucifixion; John, however, mentions *three* Passovers as attended by Jesus.

But, in spite of this, we cannot suppose that this was the only one that Jesus attended. It is more probable that, like most Jews, He came up for each one during the three years of His ministry. Only, going upon their principle of selecting events, the

[1] So also Hilgenfeld, Holsten, Krabbe, and Graf. For a detailed account of Loofs' views, see his *Die Auferstehungsberichte und ihre Wert* (Hefte zür Christliche Welt, 23), pp. 18 ff.

[2] Dr Loofs, in formulating his theory, assumes that John xxi. has a different origin from the rest of the Gospel, and believes that it consists of *two* parts: (1) verses 1-15 is really the same as the scene described in Luke v. 1-11, and does not really belong to the period after the Resurrection, while (2) verses 16-20 had originally no connection with Galilee.

three Synoptists do not record them. This is particularly curious, perhaps, in the case of Luke, as he gives us, at the close of his Gospel, the Jerusalem form of the Resurrection tradition.

But the question arises, were the first two Synoptists so defectively informed as Dr Loofs supposes? It is, perhaps, possible that, if they wrote partly with a view to edify the people of northern Palestine, they might, for this reason, deem it only necessary to mention the Galilean Appearances. But it seems strange to us that they should omit altogether those to the disciples in Jerusalem, which were both more numerous, and, we would suppose, more important. Certainly it can be urged that the last chapter, both in Mark and Matthew, is much condensed, and no special importance seems to be attached to any Appearance, except as being a fulfilment of what Jesus had predicted. Having just mentioned that Jesus fulfilled His promise to meet them there, Matthew seems to dismiss the matter. This is no doubt not the way we would view it, or proceed nowadays; but, after all, that is no measure of the purposes and procedure of a writer of the first century. It may be that he attached but little importance to the *evidence* of Appearances, and preferred to base the divine claims of Jesus upon His character and teaching. We cannot tell; we can only deal with the facts which we have before us. If the activity of Jesus, apart from the last eight days, was wholly in Galilee, at least His grave was in Jerusalem, as Prof.

Schmiedel allows. And, therefore, if Appearances were to be expected anywhere, it would probably be near the grave, in the neighbourhood of which the Evangelists all either state, or imply, that the disciples were.

Weiss [1] would cast great doubt upon the historicity of the statement (in Matthew, Mark) that the women received instructions from the angel to bid the disciples proceed to Galilee; and this the more especially as the injunction is merely a reminiscence of Jesus' words in Gethsemane, that after He had risen from the dead, He would go before the disciples into Galilee.[2] He says subsequently,[3] however, that the command of the angel to the women is only a reminiscence of the similar command which Jesus Himself gives to Mary Magdalene (Matt. xxviii. 9, 10).

The weak spot in his argument is (as Prof. Schmiedel points out), that this supposed error of fact has got itself very firmly established, not only as the angelic word (Matt. xxviii. 7), but also as a word of the risen Jesus, in the account which is guaranteed by an eye-witness.

In this theory, therefore, as in the Galilean theory, we have the difficulty of subversive MSS. evidence, which, it seems, cannot be got rid of without using violent and unwarrantable measures. Both the angelic word and the word of Jesus seem to be firmly

[1] See *Leben Jesu*, iii. p. 373 (E. Tr.).
[2] Mark xiv. 28.
[3] *Leben Jesu*, pp. 399 f.

established parts of any critical text, and both seem to oppose the theory.

Dr Resch believes [1] that the Galilean Tradition took its origin in a confusion of words. In Aramaic, there is a great similarity in the words for a 'district' and 'Galilee.' [2] He suggests, therefore, that the injunction of the 'young man' of Mark xvi. 7, is, that they should tell the disciples to go to some well-known place, or district, near at hand to meet Jesus. He also mentions the fact that mediæval traditions refer to the Mount of Olives, near Jerusalem, as called 'Galilee,' which, he supposes, must be the place indicated by Mark.

This very ingenious theory, however, has one rather serious flaw in it; there seems to be no evidence that the traditions referring to the Mount of Olives as Galilee date back much beyond the early Middle Ages. It is uncertain how this particular spot obtained the name of 'Galilee' in tradition; but Prof. Schmiedel would explain the fact as due to a desire felt even in the Middle Ages to harmonize two discordant traditions. But this explanation is extremely unlikely, as the difficulty was then practically not felt, especially by the pilgrims and others who visited the Holy Land. At the same time some other part of the country near Jerusalem might be

[1] See his *Aussercanonische Parralletexte zu Mt. und Mk.*, pp. 381 ff.

[2] A similar confusion actually exists in the Greek of the LXX. text of Ezek. xlvii. 8, where we, read: καὶ εἶπε πρὸς μέ, τὸ ὕδωρ τοῦτο τὸ ἐκπορευόμενον εἰς τὴν Γαλιλαίαν τὴν πρὸς ἀνατολάς, καὶ κατέβαινεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἀραβίαν, κ.τ.λ., where the 'east country' (A.V.), or 'eastern region' (R.V.), are rendered Γαλιλαίαν ('Galilee').

referred to by the Synoptic writers. Another objection might also be raised, viz., the fact that an Appearance in Galilee proper, near the Lake, is mentioned in the Johannine Appendix. To this, of course, it might be replied that the Appendix was probably a later addition to the Gospel, and may represent a later tradition; if this be so, the force of the objection would be greatly diminished, though this narrative would in any case point to the fact that Galilee was associated by the Christians of the late first, or early second, century with at least one Appearance of Jesus.

(3) We have now to deal with the third alternative, which is practically to combine the Traditions of Galilee and Jerusalem. This seems to have been attempted at a very early date by the addition of an Appendix to the Fourth Gospel, and by the author of the *Gospel according to Peter*. We then get the following scheme, subject to slight modifications in detail.

After the Appearances, or Appearance, at the sepulchre, Jesus appeared to Peter (and perhaps James), then to the two disciples at Emmaus, and on the evening of the same day to the Eleven in the Upper Room at Jerusalem, when they were commanded to tarry in Jerusalem for ' the promise of the Father.' The next Appearance was on the eighth day after, also in the Upper Room, when the doubts of Thomas were resolved.

The disciples are now supposed to have gone to Galilee, where the following Appearances took place: to the Seven on the shore of the Lake, to the Eleven, and the Five Hundred on some mountain.

Lastly, there is the return to Jerusalem, and the Appearance (? to James, and) to the Eleven immediately before the Ascension.

This arrangement has been severely criticized and pronounced impossible for various reasons.

The first difficulty which presents itself is the command of Jesus (Luke xxiv. 49): the disciples are told to 'tarry' in Jerusalem until the coming of the Holy Spirit. Now, we note that the ordinary Greek verb 'to remain' (*μένειν*) is not used here.[1] The verb used, *καθίζειν*, lit. 'to make to sit down' (Trans.), or 'to sit down' (Intr.), has no doubt a different shade of meaning, difficult for us to render, or appreciate, in English. Its use, therefore, in place of *μένειν*, suggests that it might be translated '*settle down in*,' rather than 'wait.' or 'tarry (permanently) in.' If this may be legitimately done without any straining of the word, it will help to remove this difficulty. The *object* of the journey too might be conceived as partly that of making arrangements for a final leaving of their homes to take up the work of preaching the Gospel.

[1] Thus Luke writes, *ὑμεῖς δὲ καθίσατε* (*not* *μένετε*, 'stay') *ἐν τῇ πόλει*. And in Acts i. 4, he says the disciples were told not to 'separate themselves from' (*χωρίζεσθαι*, *not* *ἐκλείπεσθαι*, 'abandon') Jerusalem; but to 'wait for' (*περιμένειν*) the promise of the Father, etc. The choice of words seems intentional, and not to exclude a temporary absence.

Another difficulty is found in the words of John xxi. 3, where, it is said, the disciples are obviously described as having returned to their normal occupations.

The evidence of this verse, however, is not very conclusive. In the first place, it is part of a chapter which is an addition to the original narrative, possibly, if not probably, by another hand than the writer of the Gospel. This fact weakens its authority somewhat, apart from questions as to the historical nature of the Fourth Gospel. Further, it has already been pointed out,[1] that the general tenor of the remark, taken along with the (hypothetical) *visit* to their homes, makes it not altogether improbable that the reference may be to work of an intermittent and temporary character. This argument, of course, cannot be unduly pressed, but it seems to the present writer that it is probably open to this interpretation without any unnatural straining of the narrative. The whole section, too, is almost certainly considerably later evidence (in its present form) than the narrative in chapter xx., and it is further possible that it may even be some such confused accounts of two separate events as Dr Loofs supposes. In that case, of course, it would refer to an incident in the early portion of the Ministry, and not to an Appearance at all. The chief obstacle to this view is ver. 14, which distinctly states that it was the *third* Manifestation of Jesus to His disciples, 'after that he was risen from the dead.'[2]

[1] Chap. v. p. 61.

[2] There is no MS. evidence that this verse is the gloss of a scribe.

A further, and more serious, difficulty lies in the *time* available for this itinerary. It is evident from the Narratives in Luke and John that at least *nine* days (possibly more) must be allowed for the stay in Jerusalem after the Resurrection. Now we have, in all, at our disposal *forty* days between the Resurrection and the Ascension, and since an Appearance just before the latter event is narrated by Luke, we ought to allow a week at the end of the time for residence in Jerusalem. Then provision must be made for the time occupied in journeying to and from the Lake of Galilee and Jerusalem. This would occupy at the least a week—probably rather more. Deducting, therefore, some *fourteen* days at the beginning of the period, and *seven* days at the end, with another *seven* for travelling, we are left with a fortnight, or thereabouts, for the stay of the disciples in Galilee, and the two (or three) Manifestations recorded as taking place there. The question, therefore, is, Is this sufficient? It would seem to be enough, but not more than enough. The combination of the traditions would, therefore, upon this supposition, be possible, as regards the question of time. Various other suggestions have been made to provide a longer available time, *e.g.* that the Ascension did not take place till the *following year* at this time.[1]

[1] It is curious to note, as examples of the discrepancies, and often the carelessness of early writers in regard to dates, the various statements regarding the interval between the Resurrection and Ascension. According to Irenæus, the Valentinians and Ophite Gnostics believed that Jesus

This is, however, quite inadmissible, being directly negatived by the evidence of Acts i. 3. It is also distinctly implied in John xxi. 14, that the interval was but a short one. In any case, whatever view may be taken as to the places where the various Manifestations of Jesus occurred, and the order in which they took place, it must be remembered that at a very early date—some time previous to the writing of Mark, that is to say, probably before A.D. 65, perhaps considerably less than *thirty years* after the death of Jesus, the records of the Resurrection crystallized out in two separate, and at first oral, forms :—

(1) The *Tradition of Galilee*, embodied subsequently in Matthew and Mark, and,

(2) The *Tradition of Jerusalem*, preserved a little later in Luke and the original John.

This is not equivalent to saying that these writers knew nothing of the Appearances recorded by the chroniclers of the other tradition ; but that they set on record in a written form the particular events which appealed to the interest and experiences of the people of Galilee, and of Jerusalem respectively. And since, in the order of events, the Christian Church became, at a very early date, the Church of Jerusalem, and not the Church of Capernaum, or even of Galilee, the records of the latter—imperfectly com-

remained on earth after His Resurrection *eighteen months*. The *Ascension of Isaiah*, ix. 16 (Æthiop. Vers.), makes it 545 days ; while, according to the *Pistis Sophia*, He remained on earth *eleven years* !

mitted to writing, and of small interest to the Christians whose interests centred in Jerusalem—tended more and more to fall into obscurity and neglect. Jerusalem was the scene of the great drama of the Crucifixion, the place where the Tomb of Jesus was, the spot where He overcame death, and rose triumphant over the grave. It is no wonder, therefore, that the Galilean ministry, and the events of the post-Resurrection period, which were connected with Galilee, tended to fall into the background, and the latter, indeed, almost to disappear. That an effort was made partially to counteract this tendency, we see both from the Johannine Appendix and also (perhaps) from the *Gospel according to Peter*. These documents lay some stress upon and describe in some detail an Appearance of Jesus in Galilee; and by so doing, they seem, to some extent, to be early attempts at co-ordinating and combining the two primitive forms of the Story of the Resurrection of Jesus.

CHAPTER X

THE NATURE OF THE APPEARANCES

The Theories of *Subjective* and *Objective* Vision

Prof. Schmiedel says,[1] with much emphasis, "appearances of the risen Jesus did actually occur; that is to say the followers of Jesus had the impression of having seen him"; and again, "the historian who will have it that the alleged appearances are due merely to legend, or invention, must deny not only the genuineness of the Pauline Epistles, but also the historicity of Jesus altogether." [2]

In the next place, in considering what was the *nature* of these undoubted 'appearances,' he holds that we are to understand that Jesus invariably seemed to come direct "from heaven" (c); and that He thus must have "had the nature of a heavenly body." By this he presumably means non-material, in the fullest sense of the term, to the recipients of the vision.

Again, he continues, "it was thought, as matter of course, that, after each appearance, Jesus returned

[1] § 17 (b).

[2] He mentions here three persons, who in modern times have denied the very existence of Jesus—Loman, E. Johnson, and J. M. Robertson, the well-known secularist. The first-named, he adds, withdrew his negative in 1884, and distinctly affirmed his belief in the fact in 1887.

to heaven. So regarded, each appearance ended with an ascension" (d). He admits, however, subsequently (e), that "in Jewish-Christian circles there was current a conception of a resurrection with a new earthly body," being led to this conclusion partly by the fact that "Jesus was taken to be the risen Baptist, or Elijah;[1] but he thinks that this was not the only, perhaps not the principal, conception "by which Christians were influenced," laying stress upon such passages as where it is stated that in the general Resurrection men shall be 'as the angels of God': the disciples, he argues, would be certain to apply the more exalted conception to their risen Lord.[2]

At the same time he is of opinion that St Paul would go further still in this direction, and thereby part company with the other Apostles, inasmuch as he would make the resurrection body of all believers *purely spiritual*, like that of Jesus (in his view), thus getting rid of the old carnal idea more completely than his fellow-Apostles, who, like the Pharisees and Jews generally, expected a mere re-animation of their former bodies.[3]

We gather from these statements, therefore, that in Prof. Schmiedel's view, the ideas of the Apostles regarding the Resurrection must have been in a somewhat fluent and undecided condition, now perhaps inclining to a purely spiritual conception of the risen

[1] Mark vi. 14, 16.

[2] See the *Book of Enoch*, xxxvii.-lxxi.; Dan. vii. 12, in support of the more spiritual view. Also Muirhead, *Times of Christ* (1896), pp. 140-50.

[3] See Appendix D.

Jesus, now reverting to the more material conceptions common among the Jews of that age. St Paul, on the other hand, he holds, had emancipated himself entirely (whether suddenly, or as the result of some gradual process) from the grosser views of the majority of his fellow-Christians.

This view of the matter he develops as follows: "On the other hand, it is fully to be believed that men (? the disciples) had the impression that they saw *in full reality* the wounds[1] which Jesus had received on the Cross, or perhaps even perceived that he showed them." Moreover, "the form which men beheld, must of course show *the most complete resemblance* to that which Jesus bore upon earth, and to this, after the crucifixion, the wounds necessarily belonged" (f). To put this in other words, we may say he supposes that, while the disciples probably conceived of the Appearances of Jesus as in their nature *spiritual*, nevertheless, for ordinary cognitive perception they had the psychological value of a *material* body.

But, he continues: "From the nature of the appearances as described, it is quite possible that they occurred even when the witnesses found themselves (as in John xx. 19-26) shut in with closed doors; or, as we read in Mark xvi. 14-19, when Jesus was *taken up into heaven* (sic) *direct from the apartment*" (g).

Again, he says: "On the other hand, there is to be drawn *from the various accounts* one deduction which

[1] Except the lance-wound, which he considers unhistorical. The italics throughout this chapter are ours.

goes very deep, *no words were heard from the risen Jesus.*[1] Thus, it cannot be maintained, he urges, that St Paul heard any words in his vision; and, "what holds good of the appearance to Paul is true also of the others, of which we read. If, too, we apply a searching examination to the words which have been reported, it is precisely the most characteristic of them that we shall find ourselves most compelled to abandon" (g., iii.).

We have every desire to understand clearly Prof. Schmiedel's meaning in the passages above quoted, and it appears to us that his argument is somewhat as follows. The perceived body of Jesus, though *apparently* real and objective, must have been a mere 'spiritual' (? = unreal) and subjective phenomenon *because* it appeared to come into closed rooms, and then returned forthwith, in the same manner, into 'heaven.' But a 'spiritual' being could not utter words, or even be thought to do so, *therefore* no words can really have been heard even in their imagination. Similarly also in the case of St Paul.

Now, there seems to be considerable confusion of thought and ideas throughout this argument. If Prof. Schmiedel holds, as he apparently does, that the Narratives truthfully record certain *visual* impressions—hallucinatory, we will suppose for the

[1] For words spoken to the *disciples*, etc., see Matt. xxviii. 9, 10, 18, 19, 20; [Mark xvi. 14-18;] Luke xxiv. 17, 19, 25, 36, 39, 44, 46, 48, 49; John xx. 15-17, 19, 21-23, 26, 27, 29; [xxi. 5, 6, 10, 12, 15-18, 22;] Acts i. 4, 5, 7, 8. For words to *St Paul*, Acts ix. 4-6; xxii. 7, 8, 10; xxvi. 14-18. By this extraordinary statement he probably means that the reported words are not credible.

present—why should they not also record truthfully *auditory* and *tactual* impressions of a similar character? And, if the accounts which refer to the two last-named impressions are unauthentic and untrustworthy as historic records, why are they not equally untrustworthy as regards the *visual* impressions also? It is futile to reply to this objection that the *visual* hallucinations alone are testified to by the earliest reports, and that the *auditory* and *tactual* references are additions of a later date, because there is no documentary or other positive evidence (except mere inference) to support any such distinction.[1] Apart from the well-known fact that persons subject to hallucinations are, as a rule, liable to *auditory* and *tactual*[2] as well as *visual* ones, the earliest records of the Appearances testify to *all three* forms of sensuous experience. We may lay it down as a rule, therefore, that in every case recorded in the New Testament, the visionists have *auditory* as well as *visual* experiences, whenever there is a Manifestation of a supernormal character. And the disciples in the case of every Appearance of Jesus are said to have heard *words* spoken to them; so too St Paul, except in the brief list which he gives of the Appearances to the

[1] Thus the 'hallucinatory' vision at the tomb in Mark has an *auditory* experience: the angel tells the women to go and announce the fact to the disciples. Similarly in Matthew (who drew largely from the same sources as Mark) the women both see *and* hear Jesus, and *also touch* Him. Prof. Schmiedel attempts to escape from this by asserting that these verses *must* be an interpolation. But this, in the absence of all *evidence*, is a mere *petitio principii*.

[2] *Tactual* hallucinations are certainly rarer.

disciples and himself. We may, therefore, quite legitimately ask why the *words* reported should not have been also heard (subjectively) by them. There is, in point of fact, no more difficulty in conceiving of an *auditory* hallucination than there is in supposing a *visual* one, as the records of such cases abundantly show. Why, therefore, we ask, this laboured distinction here, this anxiety to make out, if possible, that, not only the *tactual* experiences, but even the *words* heard, are all mere later and legendary additions to the original accounts, which, it is practically admitted, truly described certain *visual* (though merely subjective) impressions? If the Narratives correctly record (as Prof. Schmiedel would seem to admit) certain *visual* hallucinations, why should they not truthfully record certain *auditory*—and even *tactual* ones, also?

The distinction, which is thus drawn, seems quite unnecessary and even creates difficulties. It leads us, in fact, to a further one; the Narratives state that Jesus *ate* [1] in the presence of the disciples. But this statement Prof. Schmiedel objects to as non-historical, apparently on the following grounds :—

1. St Paul says nothing about such experiences, *i.e.* in the oldest written account of them that we possess (1 Cor. xv.); and
2. Such actions, etc., would be contrary to the nature of a being 'appearing from heaven,' *i.e.* a spiritual (=unreal) being could not

[1] Surely a *visual* experience psychologically—from the point of view of the witnesses!

eat; and Jesus 'made His Appearances' in a purely 'spiritual' form (πνεῦμα).[1]

St Paul, it is true, in his Epistles merely mentions a *visual* Manifestation to himself; but he also says elsewhere that he was *therein* 'called' to be an Apostle, and commissioned *thereby* to preach the Gospel; so that it is difficult to understand how a mere visual Apparition could convey such an idea to his mind, and urge him on to the performance of a troublesome and dangerous duty.

Moreover, it might be argued, with some show of probability, that perhaps the expression '*he was seen* (ὤφθη) by me also' has a more general and inclusive meaning in perception than mere sight.[2] Prof. Schimedel maintains, in answer to this suggestion, that "where Paul speaks of having received messages he expressly mentions 'revelations' (ἀποκαλύψεις) as well as 'visions' (ὀπτασίαι: 2 Cor. xii. 1-14); and where the distinction is employed it is clear that *spoken words* come under the former, not the latter, category." But he overlooks an important distinction here. The 'revelations' refer to mystical explanations of spiritual matters, not messages given personally, commissions to preach, etc. And 'visions' may—in fact in the New Testament generally do—include verbal informations and instructions along

[1] Or be *touched*, or (probably) even *speak*, not having the necessary vocal apparatus. Similarly *angels* are πνεύματα (spirits), and therefore *eating*, or affording *tactual* or *auditory* sensations on their part are 'unthinkable.'

[2] Thus, it is used of the sense-perception of a *blind* man in Soph., *Elect.* 945; also of *sound*-perception in *Œd. Col.* 138.

with the visual experiences.[1] The fact is, the whole distinction which is here drawn between visual and auditory—and even tactual—experiences is both illogical and untrue. And if Prof. Schmiedel cannot see his way to accepting as equally true the statements of the Evangelists that the disciples both saw Jesus, heard Him speak, touched Him, and witnessed Him eat, then he cannot consistently accept as historical fact the statements that they *saw* Him simply, even in a subjective and hallucinatory sense. And yet, despite this obvious conclusion, he asserts that " appearances of the risen Jesus did *actually occur* " ; and, " the historian who will have it that the alleged appearances are due to mere legend, or invention, must deny not only the genuineness of the Pauline Epistles, but also the historicity of Jesus altogether."

But, as we have shown, his argument for the (subjective) reality of the one experience (*visual*), and the entire falsity of the other experiences (*auditory* and *tactual*) stands self-condemned, and the whole subjective vision-theory falls with the unreliability of the Gospel records. And Prof. Schmiedel, to be consistent, should take his place amongst those who deny the very historic existence of Jesus. His implied syllogism, in truth, proves too much, and in consequence he is landed in an impossible dilemma. Indeed, the entire theory of subjective vision labours under insuperable difficulties. Unless we deny

[1] Cp. the vision of Mary (Luke i. 26 ff.), of Zechariah (i. 11 ff.), of Peter (Acts x. 13, 15), etc.

altogether well-attested historic statements, we must admit that the disciples, and others, in one's and two's, and even whole companies (on one occasion as many as five hundred persons at a time [1]) not only had the firm impression that they *saw* Jesus after His death, but also believed that He *spoke* to them, that they *touched* Him, *and saw Him eat.* Subjective vision, it may be allowed, has produced many remarkable effects at different times and in various places; but it is nowhere recorded that it produced *all* the above-noted effects over and over again, on numbers of the same people, both in and out of doors, in the early dawn, and in the full light of day as well as when the shades of evening had fallen. Much less do we find that it has ever stimulated people to undertake a work of enormous magnitude, and, while carrying it out, to lead lives of the most rigid and consistent self-denial, and even suffering. In a word, as regards this latter aspect of the question, we are constrained to agree with Dr Sanday, who says, "No apparition, no mere hallucination of the senses, ever yet moved the world."

We will turn now to a somewhat different form of the Visionary theory—that of *Objective* hallucination.[2]

[1] Against this Prof. Schmiedel (who admits that this Appearance is recorded in the earliest list) quotes (§ 36, e) a number of historic cases of collective hallucinations. But these all differ materially from the case of Jesus. In the first place, they seem to have been all of a purely visual character, and next, those who experienced them did not believe themselves urged to embark upon a hazardous undertaking by the apparition.

[2] For Keim's form of the Objective Vision theory, see Appendix C, 4.

Prof. Schmiedel would seem to allow—somewhat grudgingly—that visions may be of two kinds. Thus in discussing this matter, he refers to the "so-called Objective vision," and he says that, in contra-distinction to this, "the image that is seen in the *subjective* vision is a product of the mental condition of the seer," while in the former case (*Objective* vision) it is not. That is to say, the psychological distinction between the two is, that in the subjective form there is no *fact*, of any order of being, corresponding to the mental image in the mind of the person who experiences it; while in the Objective vision, although there is no fact immediately at hand within the range of the ordinary senses, yet there is *a fact somewhere* corresponding to it. The difference between the two may be expressed in various ways; but we will turn to two simple illustrations which will make the matter clear.

If I look out of my study window and see (let us say) a horse grazing upon my lawn, and am nevertheless told by several persons present, or discover myself by immediate personal inspection of the spot, that there is really no horse there at all, then I conclude that I have experienced a purely *subjective* and non-veridical vision, or hallucination.

But if (let us suppose) I go to bed and dream, or in my waking moments, when sitting in my arm-chair, have a kind of mental picture somehow presented to my mind, that my friend is in the act of drowning—mentally see the river, and the struggling figure in

it, and, several days afterwards, I learn that he was drowned under circumstances similar to those which I saw in my dream (or vision), then the said dream (or vision) is said to be a veridical *Objective* experience.[1]

Now, the difference between the two experiences is obvious. In the one case there was no *fact* of any kind which corresponded to the mental image, while in the other case there was a fact, but one which was quite out of the range and the possibilities of the ordinary perceptive faculties—something, indeed, which seems to have been transmitted to the deeper consciousness in some inexplicable way that, for want of a better name, we call " telepathy." It was, in any case, not due to a fact of any order (material, or non-material) *directly present* to the perceptive faculties of my conscious self.

Now, this is just the form of vision theory which is applied to the Resurrection by Dr Keim ; and when examined it breaks down just as hopelessly as the Subjective form we have been considering. Prof. Schmiedel objects to it because (he says) it involves a *miracle* equally with any theory of the actual presence of the risen Christ. But this is a mistake. It is quite possible to conceive of, and partially to explain, such an experience by some obscure process of thought transmission. The real objection to the Objective Vision theory in this case is, that it does not fit the facts as we know them. According to Dr

[1] For a very similar case see *Human Personality*, etc., by F. W. H. Myers, vol. ii. p. 329. Many others of a like kind are given in this book.

Keim, Jesus was in heaven; but somehow He was presented visually to the disciples in the Upper Room. That is to say, 'God so willed that *they thought they saw Him there*,' though He was not actually present any more than He was according to the theory of subjective vision. The difference between the two theories, it will be seen, amounts only to this; according to Prof. Schmiedel and the subjective visionists, Jesus was neither there nor (?) in heaven, and there was no more reality in their experiences than there was in the case of my horse; according to the objective theory of Dr Keim, He was all the while in heaven, but His *imago* was seen in the Holy Land.

But this, as we have seen, contradicts the statements of our Narratives, and does not help us in the least degree. If we may trust these Narratives, which, if trustworthy as regards one form of sense-perception, are, we maintain, trustworthy as regards other forms, Jesus was not only *seen* in visible presence, but *heard speaking*, *touched* by those present, and even *seen eating*. That is to say, He was *actually there* according to the plain testimony of the various senses acting in concert, as they do in ordinary daily life. And if this was not so—if He were *not* there—then, we are back again in the mere subjective form of sense-experience, and the whole matter was altogether hallucinatory, and Jesus was neither there nor in heaven; either we have hallucinations, or He was *there*, somehow, *in reality*, as we say, and as the Narratives plainly assert. If Dr Keim really

means to include all the various phenomena, recorded in the Gospels as experienced by the disciples, then he removes the matter outside of the scope of objective vision altogether. And we are left either with an actually present *fact* or else we must fall back upon some theory of general hallucination, or illusion similar to that taught in the Vedânta. In a word, Jesus was either actually there—present under some mode of *real* existence, or mankind cannot trust the evidence of their senses.

Thus the Objective Vision theory entirely breaks down, and we have the choice of two alternatives, between which most men would not hesitate for a moment to make selection.[1]

[1] For a development of the question as to how the Visional and Apparitional theories affected the Apostolic Church, see article in *Expositor*, Sept. 1908, by Prof. Orr.

CHAPTER XI

THE NATURE OF THE APPEARANCES (*continued*)

The Theories of a Revivified Body, and Pure or "Materialized" Spirit; A Spiritual Body

In addition to the foregoing, discussed in the last chapter, two other theories as to the nature of the Resurrection are passed in review by Prof. Schmiedel, viz. :—

1. The revivification of the buried body, and
2. The resurrection of the spirit only.

1. "The investigator," he says,[1] "who holds himself bound to accept, and make intelligible as literal fact, everything recorded in the resurrection narratives, even of the Canonical Gospels merely, cannot fulfil his task on any other condition than that he assumes a revivification of the buried body of Jesus to a new period of earthly life, hardly less earthly than when Jesus was taken for Elijah, or the Baptist, risen from the dead."

Now, this is tantamount to saying that the only possible alternative to a theory of vision is that of a purely *material* Resurrection, which we must also *pari ratione* apply to the predicted resurrection of all

[1] § 30 (a).

men. This idea, which would seem to have originated in Christian circles with Tertullian of Carthage (160-240 A.D.), was further developed by Peter, Bishop of Alexandria (300-311 A.D.), who assumed the headship of the anti-Origenist party,[1] and forms the basis of the grossly carnal conception which prevailed in the Middle Ages, and remains to some extent in the popular theology of to-day. We are not concerned here with showing the absurdities of this view, when it is applied to mankind at large, but would instead direct attention to the impossibilities and the crudity of the idea when it is applied to the Resurrection body of Jesus. How, for example, could we accept on this hypothesis the fact (as it is stated to be), that Jesus appeared in a room, the doors of which were shut and fastened for fear of the Jews ?

On the Vision-theory the possibility of such an Appearance is, in some degree, explicable ; but on the revivification hypothesis it it utterly inconceivable. Nor do we remove the difficulty from such an explanation by prefixing some qualifying epithet, and speaking of a ' glorified ' body.

The body of Jesus, if merely revivified, could hardly be termed ' glorified,' even if such a word would convey any definite meaning to our minds. It is obvious, indeed, that if the statements of the

[1] Origen taught that the resurrection-body would result from the germinative growth of a *principle* remaining from the old body, whose material elements had been either scattered or absorbed into other organisms. Peter, and the other anti-Origenists, denied that that was any resurrection at all. See Radford, *Three Teachers of Alexandria*, pp. 76 ff.

Narratives are to be received, we must understand that the Resurrection was no mere revivification of the former body, which was, it is stated elsewhere, like ours; but some inauguration to a different life of the former body, which had undergone a complete *transmutation* of some kind, without, however, destroying its identity and resemblance. The revivification theory, therefore, does not help us in any way with the difficulty, neither does it satisfy the conditions as laid down in the Narratives.

2. Again, "in order," says Prof. Schmiedel, "to escape so far as may be from miracle[1] . . . and generally be rid of the corporeity of the risen Jesus, recourse is often had to the view that it was only the *spirit* of Jesus that rose and appeared to his followers"—the question as to whether, or no, a 'miracle' was necessary to effect this being left open.

But here there is a fundamental objection (which is noted by him), viz., that this view is "in no respect different from the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, except in this, that in the particular case in question, the continuance of the life of the spirit begins only on the third day after death." This, however, he adds with truth, "is a collocation of heterogeneous ideas. The essence of the doctrine of immortality lies in this, that the life of the soul is never interrupted; and thus there can be no thought

[1] The implication here (§ 31) is doubtless that 'miracle' is something contrary to all cosmic order; but this definition, as we have already stated, we do not accept (see p. 46).

at all of revivification after remaining for a time in a state of death. Revivification can only occur in the case of a subject that is *capable* of dying—in other words, in a body."

We may, perhaps, not altogether assent to every statement in this quotation; for instance, it is sometimes urged, even by people of strong religious feeling, that there is no satisfactory evidence of a necessary and unconditional immortality; and that the soul of man, in the ordinary course of nature, falls into at least an eternal sleep, with the death and consequent decay of its material envelope. And they further say, that had not God raised Jesus Christ from the dead to a renewed and higher life, as a pledge of what He would do for us, we had no prospect whatever of a state of immortal existence. We will not discuss this question here; nor will we pass in review the possibility or the impossibility of some miraculous revivification of *spirit* in such a contingency as this. It will suffice to say that the theory of the Resurrection of the spirit merely equally fails with that of the revivification of the body to explain the historic phenomena of the Resurrection Narratives. A mere *spirit*, for instance, could not be *touched*; it is even doubtful whether it could be said to utter words. And, lastly, it is contradicted by the express words of Jesus Himself (Luke xxiv. 39): 'Behold my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a *spirit* hath not flesh and bones as ye see me have.'

But this brings us to the theory of many of the modern spiritualists.[1] Such persons would tell us that Jesus, equally with other men, existed after death as a spirit, and that His Appearances are to be explained in a similar way to other 'manifestations' of spirits, which can be, and are, obtained experimentally to-day, *i.e.* by "materializations." He was "materialized," through the agency perhaps of Mary Magdalene, or Simon Peter, who were unconscious "mediums."

Now, setting aside the vexed question as to the truth and actuality of these alleged phenomena, and assuming for a moment the fact of these 'materializations,' it seems to us that the recorded phenomena of the *séance* room are something quite different from the Appearances of Jesus. In the former case the spirit, in ancient times, was said to be *evoked*[2] in some way; and an elaborate psychical and physical adjustment[3] appears to be necessary in order to provide the requisite conditions for the result aimed at in the modern *séance*.

But in our Narratives, there is no question about *conditions*, whether psychical or physical. It is never the disciples who evoke, or call forth, and then help to "materialize" the Spirit of Jesus. Jesus

[1] See Appendix C, The Apparition Theory.

[2] If there is not actual *evocation* in modern *séances*, there is at least the deliberately assumed attitude of co-operation and expectancy on the part of the 'medium' and sitters, that some spirit will 'manifest.' This was not the case with those in the Upper Room and elsewhere.

[3] *E.g.*, a certain psychical *tone* in the 'medium.' Also (usually) semi-darkness, etc.

appears voluntarily, and without any preparation, or expectation, or help, on their part. He comes and goes at all times, and under all conditions. That there *may* be some sort of analogy (supposing these alleged ' manifestations ' to be matters of fact) between them and the post-resurrection Appearances of Jesus, we are not concerned either to affirm or deny. It may or may not be so. But that they are in any way *identical*, or occur under the same, or similar, conditions, we would here express our entire disbelief. Had the disciples used ancient magical methods, the fact would have been evident from the Narratives themselves. Jesus, they would have assured us, was called up just as Samuel was said to be summoned from Sheôl by the witch of Endor. Like other magicians of the time, they would have gloried rather in their own power to call Him forth from the mysterious " Beyond," than in the power of their Master and Lord to come forth Himself and bless them, unexpected and unbidden.[1] And, finally, such manifestations would probably not have ceased after forty days ;[2] they no doubt would have continued much longer ; and, in any case, the service and ritual of the Christian Church would have assimilated themselves rather to the practices of a company of first-century spiritualists, than to offerings

[1] The antipathy felt by the Apostles, and early Christians generally, to magical practices is shown by such passages as Acts xix. 13-20 ; viii. 20.

[2] The case of St Paul, and (possibly) Stephen, are, of course, excepted. In modern times spirits are said to ' grow away from earth,' usually soon after death. But a ' powerful spirit ' would be hardly likely to fade away in so short a time.

of praise and prayer, and self-consecration to God, in return for the blessings which He has vouchsafed to men.

Thus, for many and various reasons, the hypothesis of a mere risen spirit, whether 'materialized' or not, does not satisfy the accounts we have of the post-resurrection Life and Appearances of Jesus.

Finally, we are left with one alternative, but one which, we think, entirely satisfies the facts as recorded, viz., that the Resurrection body of Jesus was neither a material body revivified, nor a mere spirit-form sent forth from heaven, or lingering upon earth; but that it was, as the records show (and to borrow the language of St Paul), a *spiritual body*.

And, indeed, Prof. Schmiedel himself refers to some such solution of the problem. He says,[1] "Recourse is often had to the theory of a gradual sublimation, or spiritualization of this resurrection body of Jesus—at first wholly material—whereby it was gradually made fit for its Ascension." And, again, speaking of St Paul's teaching about the resurrection-body of each person, "Jesus' body . . . in his view must have been heavenly and pneumatic; and as Paul, in 1 Cor., has not yet given up the revivification of the buried body, he must have thought of the pneumatic attributes possessed by it as having arisen *through a metamorphosis*, such as, according to 1 Cor. xv. 51-53, is to happen also to the bodies of those men and women who shall be alive at the

[1] § 30 (b).

last day. According to what we have seen in § 17 (e) the original Apostles also agree in this."[1]

There is much real insight displayed in the quotation just made, and, if it stood alone, we would have great hopes of Prof. Schmiedel ere long accepting the fundamentals of Christian psychological teaching upon this subject. But the next paragraph disappoints any expectations that may have been formed. He continues: "Thus the explanation of the facts, which proceeds on the belief of the Apostles that the body of Jesus was really seen, must think of that body as heavenly and pneumatic; not, however, in such sense that it was given to Jesus at his resurrection as a new body, whilst the old body remained in the grave; but in the sense that it came into existence through a change wrought on the buried body. On this explanation the resurrection has as much an entirely miraculous character as it has on either of the other two theories already considered."

Here we are, therefore, back again in the old difficulty, the concept of 'miracle'! It is on this ground really that Prof. Schmiedel and his followers will have nothing to do with an *actual* Resurrection of any kind whatever; it involves a 'miracle.' But what is a 'miracle'? Prof. Schmiedel, and perhaps most other men of a scientific rather than a philosophical habit of mind, would no doubt

[1] *Ibid.* (c). If so, St Paul can hardly have regarded the Appearance to him as a mere vision.

answer, "Something *contrary* to the Laws of Nature."[1]

But this, we repeat, is essentially a wrong definition of the meaning of the word. The term 'contrary,' indeed, has no business in the definition at all. If we take the word 'miracle' and trace its origin, we find it is one of several derivatives from an old Latin root, signifying primarily, *wonder*, *astonishment*, etc. And any noun-form built up around a stem-derivative would be used to express the wonder and astonishment felt by the primitive Latin at any unfamiliar phenomenon of Nature, which he had never before witnessed, and could not explain. From such a root therefore comes *miraculum* (perhaps a diminutive originally) = a wonder, a marvel; but not of necessity implying anything supernatural, since we find it applied *inter alia* to each of the Seven Wonders of the ancient world. The *idea* underlying the word, in short, is *strangeness* and *unfamiliarity*, exciting wonder and surprise—not contrariety to Nature, but contrariety to all previous experiences. Regarded in this (its true) sense, the nature of Christ's Resurrection body, just as will be the case with the resurrection bodies of mankind, is something which is strange and wonderful *to us*, not something that is utterly opposed to the economy of the whole universe, and therefore impossible and untrue. We

[1] See also p. 46. It may be remarked here that we know nothing of any natural "Laws" (outside perhaps of mathematics), but merely certain observed sequences in phenomena.

have, in fact, to deal with something rather of the *higher-natural* order of things, which is what all spiritual existence—perhaps even that of God Himself—must, in a sense, really be. Just, for example, as the organized and animated body of the complete man is a 'miracle' from the point of view (so to speak) of the mass of inert and lifeless rock; just as it transcends in its possibilities and powers the mere non-organic substance, with which it nevertheless has some affinity, so too, we may believe, the raised and now *spiritual* body of Christ—in some way 'changed'—transcends His former body in its nature and powers; and so also will the spiritual bodies of Christians entirely transcend, and surpass in powers and worth, their former material bodies. And the 'miracle' here is not—any more than elsewhere—the *violation* of some 'natural law.' It is rather the *transcendence of some previous state or condition*, an Evolution (as we would now term it) of Being; the whole process working out, under the will of God, in some due but higher order of the spiritual-natural world, which, like the material-natural, is subject to certain changes and developments that no doubt proceed with the same fixed regularity and sequence which we observe in the phenomena of the lower world. Thus, we may even say that God is subject to law—the law which He Himself has imposed on His own Being. And if it be objected, as doubtless it will be, that we know nothing of this spiritual world, nothing of the 'laws'

which may regulate it, we may to a great extent concede the objection. But when Prof. Schmiedel goes further than this, and says, "the thing (*i.e.* the spiritual body) is quite *inconceivable*; how is one *to represent to himself the stages of the transaction?*" we must demur.

For, surely this is no reason for its absolute and summary rejection. Are we to reject everything as impossible and 'inconceivable,' which is at present incapable of full explanation, or even any explanation at all? Take, for example, *thought*, even in its simpler forms, the genesis (let us say) of a *percept*. Who can explain that? Who, indeed, can form the least conception of all the 'stages' through which it passes? I see (let us suppose) a tree; I hear its leaves rustle; I go up to it, touch it, and assure myself of its *reality*, as I say. And, eventually, these various discrete sensations emerge from my mind as a fully formed and concrete *percept* of what I call a tree.

Now, how is this generated; what are its 'stages'? We can, it is true, partially explain it. Certain æther-waves, we say, impinge upon the nervous network forming the retina of the eye, which is connected with the brain by the optic nerve; certain air-waves strike the tympanum, etc., of the ear, which is joined by a special auditory nerve to the brain; certain molecular vibrations are set up in the terminals of the afferent nerve-fibres which stretch from the finger-tips to the brain. All these specialized nerves —visual, auditory, tactual—*vibrate*, and transmit

their molecular vibrations to 'the seat of intelligence,' the cells forming the grey matter of the cerebral lobes of the brain. And then—suddenly—no man knows *how*—a *percept* leaps forth, as it were, into consciousness; by some subtle alchemy, which we do not understand and cannot in the least degree explain, a *mental picture* arises in the mind. The *material* seems, as it were, to give rise to the *immaterial*, matter, in some way, apparently assisting in the genesis of conscious thought.

Now we have here also a mysterious metamorphosis, which, in our present state of knowledge, is utterly inexplicable. But who, for that reason, would be bold enough to deny either its possibility or its existence? We cannot, of course, do this, because we realize that it takes place day by day all around us; nay more, we are conscious of it ourselves each moment of our waking lives. But by the rule, as laid down by Prof. Schmiedel, that what is unrepresentable to our minds in all its stages must be forthwith dismissed as 'inconceivable,' that is to say *incredible* and *unreal*, we should reject our very percepts themselves, which we form from moment to moment each day of our lives.[1]

We ought, indeed, by such reasoning, to plunge ourselves outright into the very abyss of all ideational as well as material negation, and assert that *nothing* can be accepted as *real* and *true*, neither the material

[1] The genesis and "stages" of a higher *concept* are perhaps even more mysterious and inexplicable.

Cosmos outstretched before us, nor our own thoughts and mind by which we know of it—all these must be rejected as 'inconceivable,' *because* we cannot 'represent to ourselves' the various 'stages' by which they have come into being, and are conceived! Such, indeed, is the inevitable and logical issue of the theory that nothing can be received as conceivable and possible, but what we can fully understand and represent in its various stages to our minds. It is doubtful, indeed, whether we can really explain, and therefore by this rule accept, anything whatever. Our refuge, therefore, as consistent thinkers, should be in *absolute and universal negation*—if that be possible.

But to return, and to conclude this chapter. Christianity, when rightly understood, supplies us with both the loftiest and the most complete scheme of a religious psychology. It teaches us the doctrine of the formation of an ultimate, as well as complete and permanent, *spiritual body*, in which all the various imperfections and limitations incidental to our present 'natural' (or psychical) body will be removed. And this spiritual body is henceforth to be the shrine or vehicle of the fully developed and enfranchized *pneuma*.[1] This result, we are assured, has already been attained in the human nature of the Person of Jesus Christ.[2] In His case, the human *pneuma*, conjoined with the Divine Nature, has become perfected in a transformed and spiritual body, exalted above even its previous

[1] Eph. ii. 19. [2] 1 Cor. xv. 20.

human limitations and possibilities; no longer subject to weariness and sickness and decay and death, because no longer earthly and material in its nature.

And a corresponding change (so Christianity also teaches) awaits equally all Christians. Christ, already the "first-fruits" of this redemptive process; "afterward," when the time is fulfilled, "they that are Christ's at his coming;" [1] when we shall "grow up unto him in all things, who is the head, even Christ," [2] reaching then "the full-grown man," by attaining "unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ." [3]

[1] 1 Cor. xv. 23. [2] Eph. iv. 15. [3] *Ibid.* iv. 13.

CHAPTER XII

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

We have now to gather together the various strands of our discussion and weave them into one cable upon which will hang the conclusion of our argument, the historic *fact* of the actual Resurrection of Jesus.

And, first of all, it will be convenient to summarize briefly Prof. Schmiedel's main position. He would, it seems, reject the traditional interpretation of the Resurrection Narratives upon two principal grounds:—

1. The purely *subjective* character, as he supposes, of the nature of the Appearances of Jesus, and
2. The *untrustworthiness*, owing to internal discrepancies, of the Narratives themselves.

1. We endeavoured to show in the preceding chapter that the Theory of Subjective Vision wholly breaks down when applied to these Manifestations. Prof. Schmiedel would appear to argue that the reported Appearances as *visual hallucinations* are historical; but as regards their being also *auditory* and *tactual* experiences they are not historical. This distinction, however, cannot be maintained. For, if we take, as he desires, the (probably) earliest written document, St Paul's brief list, we have, in addition to the visual

phenomenon in his own case, an *auditory* one likewise implied. For, how else did he infer that he was commissioned to preach the Gospel?[1] Certainly he did not derive that idea from the disciples, because they everywhere for some time were suspicious of him, and rather shunned than sought his alliance.[2] Similarly, too, with what may be assumed as the primitive Gospel statement of the matter—the narrative of Mark. Here also we have what Prof. Schmiedel must admit was a vision, in which both visual *and* auditory experiences occur. The angel appears to the women and delivers a message. It is unfortunate in the extreme that the genuine conclusion of Mark should have been lost at such an early date, because, in all probability, we would have had further evidence of an Appearance of, and words spoken by, Jesus Himself.

Harnack[3] and Rohrbach are inclined to think that the present final chapter of John represents the lost ending of Mark's Gospel, and recently Prof. Lake has stated that, "there is certainly not a little to be said for this hypothesis."[4]

Other critics—*e.g.* Mr Allen—think it is to be found in the hypothetical document which was the

[1] The same question may, of course, be asked of the disciples, who must have *thought they heard* a commission.

[2] Gal. i. 12; Eph. iii. 3.

[3] *Chronologie*, i. pp. 696 ff.

[4] *Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, pp. 218-19. The only thing practically certain about it is, that the lost ending must have contained an account (relating, no doubt, words spoken) of some Appearance in Galilee, probably near the Lake.

underlying source of both Matt. xxviii. 16-20, and Mark's real conclusion.

Whether, or no, either of these hypotheses be the solution of the problem, it is obvious that our conclusion above stated is quite justified. Further, in both Luke and John, we have recorded, in addition, *tactual* experiences on the part of the disciples.

Now, we must, in the first place, entirely protest against Prof. Schmiedel's offhand assumption that because a Gospel written a few years later records certain Manifestations in a somewhat fuller manner, these additional details are *therefore* legendary additions. They may, or may *not*, be so. The main difference between Luke and his predecessors is, that he adds further *tactual* experiences.[1] And, in the last chapter we showed that there is no valid reason against adopting these experiences also amongst the 'subjective' phenomena (as Prof. Schmiedel would consider them) of the Resurrection. We cannot limit even hallucinations; and, if the disciples *saw* and *heard* (or *thought* they saw and heard Jesus), there is no valid reason whatever why they should not have (subjectively at least) *touched* Him. The whole of the recorded experiences, in fact—from the point of view of subjective phenomena — stand or fall together.

But then, as we have already endeavoured to show, this proves altogether too much. It is absolutely

[1] Luke's general historical accuracy and credibility, which were formerly much impugned, have of recent years been very clearly shown by Sir William Ramsay, who has made a special study of the matter.

inconceivable that as many as (say) five hundred persons, of average soundness of mind and temperament, in various numbers, at all sorts of times, and in divers situations, should experience all kinds of sensuous impressions—visual, auditory, tactual—and that all these manifold experiences should rest entirely upon subjective hallucination. We say that this is incredible, because if such a theory were applied to any other than a 'supernatural' event in history, it would be dismissed forthwith as a ridiculously insufficient explanation.

But, Prof. Schmiedel further objects on this head, that these same witnesses were not scientifically trained experts, and were, therefore, incompetent to record credible testimony. Now, would the employment of such experts have removed the objection, and cleared away the difficulty? Let us see. We can remember several instances of such 'expert' investigation, one of which we will quote in this connection. In 1779, a committee of *savants* was appointed by the French government of the day to examine and report upon the alleged phenomena of "Mesmerism." Their unanimous conclusion was, that there was no psychological basis for them, and that they were solely the effects of imposture. Within little more than a hundred years afterwards these same phenomena were a scientific commonplace.

Neither do we believe that, had the question of the Empty Tomb been investigated immediately by a committee of opponents (as Prof. Schmiedel seems

to wish), the inquiry could have resulted otherwise than in the report, which subsequently circulated amongst the Jews—that the disciples had *stolen* the body and then *invented* the story of the Resurrection; nor that the report of so competent (!) a tribunal would, if favourable, have met with general acceptance.[1] The fact, of course, is that there is no tribunal, or committee, who are competent (in Prof. Schmiedel's sense of the term) to decide whether such events are absolutely and entirely true or not. We have by no means exhausted the possibilities of the Universe, or discovered all the plans and resources of God; and the 'trained intelligence' in such cases is, like any other, hampered and circumscribed by the limitations of thought and previous experience. And, in any case, we always can, if so minded and anxious to be rid of them, refer *all* experiential phenomena to hallucination. What then remains? Simply the question of their possibility and probability as matters of historic witness. And this brings us to our next point.

2. This is the alleged untrustworthiness of the Narratives as historic documents. Upon what does this charge rest? Upon their 'discrepancies.' Let

[1] We might, perhaps, add here another more modern instance in which it seems possible that history may again repeat itself. Certain researches in 'psychic' phenomena have of recent years been undertaken by Sir Wm. Crookes, Profs. Richet, Lombroso, Botazzi, Zöllner, and others. These, whatever may be their ultimate value and meaning, are received with mere incredulity by the majority of their colleagues. See, *e.g. Researches into the Phenomena of Spiritualism*, Crookes; *Metapsychical Phenomena*, Dr Maxwell, and *On Spirit Phenomena and their Interpretation*, Cesare Lombroso.

us examine this position from a general point of view.

Prof. Schmiedel states in the introductory section to his Article,[1] that Reimarus,[2] in his well-known *Wolfenbüttel Fragments*, enumerated "ten contradictions" in the Resurrection Narratives. Prof. Schmiedel, however, by the exercise of great industry, and by the most minute analysis of the documents, has raised the number to *twenty*. Most of these alleged 'contradictions' we have already noticed and discussed, in dealing with the separate Appearances. Some we found to depend upon an obvious misunderstanding of the author's meaning, and resolvable without difficulty with a truer interpretation of the text. Others were errors plainly due either to the alarm and confusion of the crisis, or to the inaccuracy in detail of the sources of the writer's information. A few genuine discrepancies were left, which, with the incomplete information at present at our disposal, we perhaps cannot remove. And the question then arises, how do these affect the *general* veracity of the Narratives?

This problem is really one which turns largely upon the nature and value of evidence; and this being so, let us treat it here from that standpoint. Let us see, for instance, how a trained judge acts when an intricate and difficult case is brought before him, in which there are discrepancies in the evidence.

Now, in all evidence worth considering, we find

[1] § 2. [2] 1758-1823 A.D.

either of two conditions to prevail. (1) The witnesses all agree, not only on the *main* points, but also in *minor details*; (2) They all agree on the *main* points, but *not in the details*. In the latter case there is divergency of statement to a greater or less degree. How then does the judge in general proceed? After an analysis of the evidence as a whole, in which he separates the essential from the non-essential, he comes to the following general conclusion, that in (1) there are very strong suspicions of *collusion*; that is to say there is a probability that the witnesses have met together previously and "compared notes," or got up by heart a carefully prepared story. In short (in such a case) their statements are not altogether to be trusted *because they agree with one another in minute points*. He is, in fact, for that reason somewhat predisposed against them, and if he finds that on cross-examination they have broken down at all, he advises the jury to reject their testimony.

On the other hand, in (2) he points out that they undoubtedly confirm one another on the main issue, though they differ somewhat in unimportant detail. And this latter fact shows that there has not been collusion of any kind, and therefore their story has not been carefully prepared and learnt beforehand. Such a group of witnesses, indeed, are considered, in point of law, the very best possible ones, and *ceteris paribus* worthy of credence.

Now, the application here is obvious. And in

truth our negative critics, even when they declaim loudly against ' discrepancies ' in detail of the evidence for the Resurrection, would be the first to raise the cry of ' collusion,' did the several accounts we have correspond exactly throughout. But because, on the other hand, they differ somewhat in detail, they cannot do this, and so instead they complain of ' discrepancies and contradictions.'

This, however, is an unfair way of treating any evidence, even evidence for the supernormal. We have, in various places, shown that there is abundant reason why these Narratives should so vary ; and the wonder is, not that they do vary, but that they do not vary still more. And, if it be objected here, that this admission conflicts with the presumption of a divine guidance of the writers, producing practically a ' verbally inspired ' text, we reply, that the Bible itself nowhere claims such inspiration, and that a theory of divine *dictation* of sentence by sentence, and word by word, is never held by thoughtful and educated men.[1] It is, in short, the refuge of the vulgar and the illiterate.

Now, considering the problem before us on these lines, what do we find to be the case ? We find that, while differing in, it may be, many minor details, the Resurrection Narratives are *absolutely at one* upon these two main issues :—

[1] We owe it largely to the exaggerated ideas of the Scriptures introduced at the Reformation period. A brief examination of any half-dozen ancient MSS., and even an elementary knowledge of the principles and facts of textual criticism, would dispel any such absurd idea.

1. That there was a *bodily Resurrection* on the third day, of a supernormal nature, which no writer describes.
2. That certain *supernormal Manifestations* of the risen Jesus took place, witnessed by numbers of people at different times, and in different places.

There are, of course, numerous other points, of minor importance mostly, upon which they are also agreed; but we confine ourselves to the two chief ones. And, further, these two facts, which they bear witness to, produced, we learn, in the minds of the disciples certain results which we will describe in the words of critics who cannot be suspected of any strong partiality in their favour. "The *firm conviction*," Prof. Harnack admits,[1] "of the disciples in Jesus Christ was rooted in the belief that He did not abide in death, but was raised by God. That Christ *had risen*, was, in virtue of what they had experienced in Him, certainly *only after they had seen Him, just as sure as the fact of His death*, and became the main article of their preaching about Him."

And even Prof. Weizsäcker allows,[2] that "when Peter saw the first manifestation his faith arose. It was the starting-point of his new faith, i.e. *faith in the risen Christ, something quite different from his former trust in a living Master.*"

Now, these are the admissions of keen critics,

[1] *Hist. of Dogma*, E. Tr., vol. i. p. 84. Italics are ours.
[2] *The Apostolic Age of the Church*, E. Tr., p. 3.

not the *ex parte* statements of professed apologists. There is much, indeed, in the Narratives which it is impossible to deny, and amongst this is the element of the supernormal. And so, if that cannot be denied outright in point of fact, it must be explained away, or got rid of in some fashion. If the statements that Jesus died and was buried, and *appeared again* after death (and revival theories are quite given up nowadays, in the best-informed quarters), are incontrovertible facts, then the last-named fact must be repudiated somehow. It involves the 'supernatural,' says the negative critic; there is no supernatural, he continues, therefore . . . it *must* be hallucination. Such is the logic of the modern critic of the negative school! The *crux* of the whole matter, indeed, is this very question of the 'supernatural.' For several generations past many of the German and other critics have made up their minds that the 'supernatural,' as a factor in the equation of human experience, must be entirely eliminated. That this view, however, is showing signs of passing away is evidenced by, amongst other things, the very general interest evoked of late years by 'psychic' phenomena. Meanwhile the old prejudice is still to be observed in less liberal minds, which are not open to conviction, and are less awake to the various signs of the times.

The whole question, so far as it refers to the Resurrection, is well summed up by Mr C. L Broun, who says[1]:—

[1] *Interpreter*, Oct. 1905, 'Protestant Criticism of the N. T. in Germany.'

"The German theologians rejecting the Gospel story feel themselves nevertheless obliged to explain the belief which worked a revolution in the world. This can be most simply done by postulating a mere vision of Christ: and this theory, in itself by no means new, is considered to receive support from the earliest evidence—St Paul's account in 1 Cor. xv.

"'Here,' say Harnack's disciples, 'we have no material resurrection, no tomb-story, no eating and handling—nothing but a simple appearance; and the occurrence of visions no one can deny.' Equally, of course, a vision proves nothing. Renan did not deny that Mary Magdalene saw a vision—she was an *hallucinée*. So now the German school. They make St Paul's own vision the starting-point. It is purely spiritual, for Jesus' body is spiritual: therefore, *ipso facto*, only perceptible to the spirit. But he ranges (? all) the older Appearances by the side of his own vision: therefore they too were not corporeal manifestations, and Paul knows nothing of the empty grave. All this is inconclusive enough, but there is not space to dwell upon it. The essential point is, was Christ proved to be living, or not? The Apostles thought so; but the whole rationale of the vision-theory is that what was supposed to be a proof of fact, can in this way be relegated to the category of hallucinations. All then depends on the question, Was the vision objective, or purely subjective? Now an objective vision is simply the appearance or presentation of some person or thing to another:

the thing, or person, is, as the ordinary man would say, 'really there':[1] while the objects seen, *e.g.* by a person suffering from *delirium tremens*, are, though certainly real to his mind, 'not really there.' This is, of course, a perfectly satisfactory distinction: but what is the *criterion* of objectivity?

"There can be only one, not an absolutely certain one: i.e. *the simultaneous perception of the object by more persons than one.* Not absolutely certain, for it is proved that a considerable number of persons can be hypnotized together: yet under ordinary circumstances universally recognized as valid. Now the whole point of the German theory of the Resurrection is, that the vision was purely subjective, and the whole force of the argument rests upon the statements of St Paul; and yet, according to St Paul, three out of five Appearances to the first Christians are to a whole company of persons simultaneously; and one was to 'five hundred brethren at once.' The insoluble puzzle to the unsophisticated intelligence, how a person seen by five hundred men at once can be only 'subjectively' present, actually seems not to have presented itself to the German theologians at all.[2] At all events the whole series of them repeat the theory without any consciousness that the difficulty exists, and not one but is perfectly satisfied that the

[1] The writer is here using the phrase 'Objective Vision' in a slightly different sense from that in which it was employed on p. 138. Here the fact corresponding to the image is present to the senses. There it was not present, but existent elsewhere.

[2] See p. 136.

whole 'supernatural' riddle is once and for all answered and done with. For us, it must suffice to say, that unless the whole significance of the word is to be reversed, the Appearances of Jesus after His death were as objective . . . as any phenomenon can be."

Now, if we too are not entirely committed to a prejudgment of a negative character, it seems that we must, in the main at least, agree with this statement of the matter. And we cannot state our own conclusions on the question—conclusions arrived at after a careful survey of the whole of the evidence at our disposal—better than by quoting the words of a critic who was in his day one of the acutest and most learned amongst the Germans, the theologian De Wette.[1] His final opinion on this subject, formulated shortly before his death, he expressed in these words :[2] "The *fact* of the Resurrection, although a darkness which cannot be dissipated rests on the way and the manner of it, cannot be doubted."

We will only add that both the fact itself and the darkness which enshrouds it still remain; the former is not disproved, nor is the latter dispelled by the negative criticism of to-day.

[1] 1780-1849 A.D.

[2] Concluding Essay appended to *Historical Criticism of the Evangelical History* (1848), p. 229. It is said that the great German historian Neander shed tears when reading this passage.

APPENDIX A

EXTRA-CANONICAL RESURRECTION NARRATIVES

1. *Didascalia Apostolorum.*[1]

". . . 'in the Gospel of Matthew it is written that in the evening of the sabbath, when the first day of the week dawned, came Mary and another Mary, the Magdalene to see the sepulchre. And there was a great earthquake, for the angel of the Lord came down and rolled [away] the stone.' And again the sabbath day. Then three hours of the night, in which our Lord slept [and rose], and the saying was fulfilled [Mary, take heed!] that, it is required of the Son of Man that he should pass through the heart of the earth, three days and three nights, as it is written in the Gospel. Again, it is written in David, 'Behold, thou hast appointed my days by measure, because, therefore, these days and nights are made shorter. Thus, it is written, 'In the night, therefore, as the first day of the week dawned, he was seen by Mary Magdalene, and by Mary the daughter of James, and in the night of the first day of the week he went in to Levi,[2] and then he was seen also by us'; moreover, he said to us, while he was teaching us, Wherefore do ye fast on my account in these days," etc.

[1] *Horæ Semiticæ*, No. 1, M. D. Gibson, 1903. This work is believed to have reached its present form in the third century, but to be based upon older sources.

[2] This Appearance is nowhere else recorded. Mention is made of Levi in the *Gospel of Peter*, but in a totally different connection. The fasting is also mentioned in that work. The *Didascalia* is first mentioned by Serapion (Bp. of Antioch, 190-203 A.D.), who (Eusebius, *H. E.* vi. 12, 2) rejected it as a spurious work.

2. *A Coptic Resurrection Narrative.*[1]

This tells us that,—Mary, Martha and Mary Magdalene wish to anoint the body of Jesus, but find the sepulchre empty. Jesus appears to them and says, 'I am he whom ye seek,' and bids that one of them go to their brethren and say, 'Come, the Master is risen.' Martha does so, but meets with no credence; and Mary, whom Jesus sends after Martha has reported her failure, has no better success. Finally Jesus Himself goes along with the women, calls the disciples out, and, as they still continue to be in doubt, bids Peter, Thomas and Andrew touch His hands, His side and His feet respectively, quoting *Wisd.* xviii. 17. Then they confess their sins, and especially their unbelief.

3. *The Gospel of Peter.*[2]

"And upon all these things we fasted and sat mourning and weeping night and day until the Sabbath. But the Scribes and Pharisees and Elders, being gathered together one with another, when they heard that all the people murmured and beat their breasts, saying, If by his death these most mighty signs have come to pass, see how righteous he is. And the Elders were afraid and came to Pilate, beseeching him and saying, Give us soldiers that we may guard his sepulchre for three days, lest his disciples come and steal him away, and the people suppose that he is risen from the dead and do us evil. And Pilate gave them Petronius, the centurion,

[1] Described by C. Schmidt (*Sitzungsberichte der Berlinischen Akadamie der Wissenschaften*, 1895, pp. 705-11). The conversation of the risen Jesus with His disciples, contained in it, has been discussed by Harnack (*Theol. Studien für B. Weiss*, 1897, pp. 1-8), who dates it somewhere between 150 and 180 A.D.

[2] A fragment of this lost Gospel was found in 1886-7, in an ancient cemetery at Akhmim (Panopolis) in Upper Egypt. The parchment codex is assigned to a date between the eighth and twelfth centuries. The Greek text has been edited (in England), with an E. Tr. published by Dean Robinson (*The Gospel and Apocalypse of Peter*: Two Lectures, etc., Camb., 1892) and by Prof. Swete; Germ. Eds. by Harnack and Zahn. It is Docetic and anti-Jewish, but was *possibly* used by Justin Martyr.

with soldiers to guard the tomb. And with them came Elders and Scribes to the tomb, and they, together with the Centurion and soldiers, having rolled a great stone there, set it at the door of the sepulchre, and they affixed seven seals,[1] and pitched a tent there and guarded it.

"And early in the morning, as the sabbath was drawing on, there came a multitude from Jerusalem and the region round about, that they might see the tomb that was sealed. And in the night in which the Lord's day was drawing on, as the soldiers kept guard two by two in a watch, there was a great voice in the heavens; and they saw the heavens opened, and two men descend from thence with a great light, and approach the tomb. And that stone, which was put at the door, rolled of itself and made way in part; and the tomb was opened, and both the young men entered in.

"When, therefore, those soldiers saw it, they awakened the Centurion, and the Elders; for they too were hard by keeping guard. And, as they declared what things they had seen, again they see three men coming forth from the tomb, and two of them supporting one, and a cross following them: and the heads of the two [men] reached unto heaven, but the head of him that was led by them overpassed the heavens. And they heard a voice from the heavens saying, 'Thou hast preached to them that sleep.' And a response was heard from the Cross, 'Yea.'

"They, therefore, considered one with another whether to go away and show these things to Pilate. And while they yet thought thereon, the heavens again are seen to open, and a certain man to descend and enter into the tomb. When the Centurion and they that were

[1] Cp. Rev. v. 1. It would be interesting to know whether the idea here is derived from the Prætorian Will of Roman Law. This will, when written, was witnessed and sealed sevenfold, as an attestation of the genuineness of the document. See Maine's *Ancient Law*, chap. vi.

with him saw these things, they hastened in the night to Pilate, leaving the tomb which they were watching, and declared all things which they had seen, being greatly distressed and saying, 'Truly he was the Son of God.' Pilate answered and said, 'I am pure from the blood of the Son of God; but it was ye who determined this.' Then they all drew near and besought him, and entreated him to command the Centurion and the soldiers to say nothing of the things which they had seen; For it is better, say they, for us to be guilty of the greatest sin before God, and not to fall into the hands of the people of the Jews, and be stoned. Pilate, therefore, commanded the Centurion and soldiers to say nothing.

"And at dawn upon the Lord's day, Mary Magdalene, a disciple of the Lord, fearing because of the Jews, since they were burning with wrath, had not done at the Lord's tomb the things which women are wont to do for those that die, and for those who are beloved by them, took her friends with her and came to the sepulchre where he was laid. And they feared lest the Jews should see them, and they said, Although on that day on which he was crucified we could not weep and lament, yet now let us do these things at his tomb. But who shall roll away for us the stone that was laid at the door of the tomb, that we may enter in and sit by him, and do those things that are due? For the stone was great, and we fear lest someone see us. And, if we cannot, yet, if we but set at the door the things which we bring for a memorial of him, we will weep and lament until we come unto our home.

"And they went out and found the tomb opened, and coming near they looked in there; and they see there a certain young man sitting in the midst of the tomb, beautiful and clothed in a robe exceeding bright, who said to them, Wherefore are ye come? Whom seek ye? Him that was crucified? He is risen and gone. But

if ye believe not, look in and see the place where he lay, that he is not [there]; for he is risen and gone thither whence he was sent. And the women feared and fled.

"Now, it was the last day of the unleavened bread, and many were going forth, returning to their homes, as the feast was ended. And we, the twelve disciples of the Lord, wept and were grieved: and each one, being grieved for that which was come to pass, departed to his home. Now I, Simon Peter and Andrew my brother, took our nets and went to the sea; and there was with us Levi, the son of Alphæus, whom the Lord . . ."

[Here the fragment breaks off abruptly.]

The lost continuation undoubtedly related an Appearance of Jesus by the Lake of Galilee, similar to that in John xxi. But in John it is precisely Andrew and Levi who are not mentioned. The question, therefore, is, Can the 'two other of his disciples' (ver. 2) have been Andrew and Levi?

Schmiedel thinks the 'two' were added in John xxi. to make up the mystical number 7; but there is no direct proof of this. According to 1 Cor. xv. and Luke xxiv. 34, Peter would seem to have been alone when first he saw Jesus, but that was apparently in Jerusalem. It may also be noted that this fragment omits to state that the women told the disciples.

4. *The Gospel according to the Hebrews.*[1]

"1 And when the Lord had given his linen cloth to the servant of the priest,[2] he went to James, and appeared to him;

[1] *The Gospel acc. to the Hebrews*, E. B. Nicholson, 1879, pp. 65-74. Some thirty fragments of this lost Gospel are known. Irenæus is perhaps the first writer who distinctly refers to it. He says that the Ebionites only used the *Gospel acc. to Matthew*, and that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew (Aramaic). Hence (some say) he regards the two as identical. This is, however, very doubtful. It no doubt contained very early tradition, dating back probably to the first century.

[2] Malchus (Maluch) appears to be referred to (John xviii. 10).

2 For James had sworn that he would not eat bread from that hour wherein he had drunk the cup of the Lord until he saw him rising again from the dead.

3 . . . bring a table and bread,

4 [And ?] he took up the bread and blessed [God] and brake [it], and afterwards gave to James the Just, and said to him, My brother, eat thy bread ; for the son of man is risen from them that sleep. . . . . And, when he came to those about Peter, he said to them, Take, feel me and see, that I am not a bodiless dæmon.[1] And straightway they touched him and believed " (cp. Ign. *ad Smyr.* iii. 2).

We may note here the difference from 1 Cor. xv. 7, in the time of the Appearance to James. Here it is one of the first Appearances.

5. *Ascension of Isaiah.*[2]

In a Christian section (iii. 14 ff.), inserted in this book, we have the following account :—

" 14. And the Twelve who were with him should be offended because of him : and * the watch of * those who watched the sepulchre. 15. And the descent of the Angel of the Christian Church, which is in the heavens, whom he will summon

[1] ' Bodiless devil ' (Nicholson). The Jews, he says, believed that these dæmons possessed the living, and were sometimes the spirits of deceased persons. But this seems an argument against his translation ' devil.' In later times they were, however, certainly regarded as evil and malicious in character. But cp. the *dæmon* of Socrates (Plato, *Phæd.* 107.E, 108.B, 113.D), and see Zeller, *Socrates*, pp. 73-81.

[2] This work, according to Prof. Charles, is a composite one, partly of Jewish, and partly of Christian origin. The Jewish part seems to have been derived from a *Martyrdom of Isaiah* ; the Christian to be based upon two originally independent writings, the *Testament of Hezekiah*, and the *Vision of Isaiah*. These, and especially the latter, throw much light upon Christian thought and belief at the end of the first century.

in the last days. 16. And that (Gabriel,) the angel of the Holy Spirit, and Michael, the chief of the holy angels, on the third day, will open the sepulchre.[1] 17. And the Beloved sitting on their shoulders will come forth and send out his twelve disciples. 18. And they will teach all the nations, and every tongue of the resurrection of the Beloved . . ."

6. *Acts of Pilate.*[2]

In the first Greek version, Joseph of Arimathæa had been committed to custody by the Sanhedrin for begging the body of Jesus, but had mysteriously disappeared from the prison. A meeting of the Sanhedrin is held to consider the matter. Chap. xv.: "And while they were still sitting in the Synagogue, and wondering about Joseph, there came some of the guard, whom the Jews had begged of Pilate to guard the tomb of Jesus that his disciples might not come and steal him. And they reported to the rulers of the Synagogue, and the priests, and the Levites what had happened; how there had been a great earthquake, and we saw an angel coming down from heaven, and he rolled away the stone from the mouth of the tomb and sat upon it, and he shone like snow and like lightning. And we were very much afraid, and lay like dead men; and we heard the voice of the angel saying to the women who remained beside the tomb, Be not afraid, for I know that ye seek Jesus who was crucified; he is not here; he is risen, as he said; come and see the place where the Lord lay; and go quickly and tell his disciples that he is risen from the dead, and is in Galilee (Matt. xxviii. 5, 7). The Jews say, To what woman did he speak? The men of the guard say, We do not know who they were. The Jews say, At what time was this? The men of the

[1] Cp. Luke xxiv. 4; John xx. 12; *Gospel of Peter*, 10.

[2] A highly legendary work of the fourth or fifth century, extant in Greek and Latin. The author was probably a Hellenistic Jew.

guard say, At midnight. The Jews say, And wherefore did you not lay hold of them? The men of the guard say, We were like dead men from fear, not expecting to see the light of day, and how could we lay hold of them? The Jews say, As the Lord liveth, we do not believe you. The men of the guard say to the Jews, You have seen so great miracles in the case of this man, and have not believed; and how can you believe us? And assuredly you have done well to swear that the Lord liveth, for, indeed, he does live. Again the men of the guard say, We have heard that you have locked-up the man who begged the body of Jesus, and put a seal on the door, and that you opened it and did not find him. Do you then give us the man you were guarding, and we will give you Jesus. The Jews say, Joseph has gone away to his own city. The men of the guard say to the Jews, And Jesus has risen, as we have heard from the angel, and is in Galilee.

"Now when the Jews heard these words, they were very much afraid and said, We must take care lest this story be heard, and all incline to Jesus. And the Jews called a council, and paid down a considerable sum of money, and gave it to the soldiers, saying, Say, while we slept, his disciples came by night and stole him; and if this come to the ears of the procurator, we will persuade him and keep you out of trouble." [1]

Chap. xvi.: This goes on to say, "And Phinees, a priest, and Adas, a teacher, and Haggai, a Levite, came down from Galilee to Jerusalem, and said to the rulers of the synagogue and the priests and the Levites, We saw Jesus and his disciples sitting on the mountain called Mamileh; and he said to his disciples, Go ye into

[1] Several of the Latin versions add here, "they took the money, but could not hide the truth. For they wanted to say, His disciples stole him while we slept, but could not say it; but they said (instead), Truly the Lord Jesus has risen from the dead, and we saw an angel of God coming down from heaven, and he rolled back the stone, and sat on it. And this saying has been spread abroad among the Jews even to this day."

all the world, and preach the Gospel to every creature," etc.

After their report is heard, these three men are made to swear that they would not tell these matters to anyone, and are sent away to Galilee. The Narrative then proceeds :—

". . . the chief priests, and the rulers of the synagogue and the Elders, came together into the synagogue and locked the door, and lamented with a great lamentation, saying, Is this a miracle which has happened in Israel ? And Annas and Caiaphas said, Why are you so much moved ? Why do you weep ? Do you not know that his disciples have given a sum of gold to the guards of the tomb, and have instructed them to say that an angel came down, and rolled away the stone from the door of the tomb ? And the priests and elders said, Be it that his disciples have stolen his body ; how is it that life has come into his body, and that he is going about in Galilee ? And they being unable to give an answer to these things, said, after great hesitation, It is not lawful for us to believe the uncircumcised."

Nicodemus then stands up in the Council, and proposes that they should send to Galilee, and try to find Jesus. This they agree to do, and send, but cannot find Him. They find Joseph of Arimathæa, however ; but dare not touch him. The council, on hearing the report of the messengers, send a letter to Joseph, asking him to come to Jerusalem ; this he does, and stays in the house of Nicodemus. On being asked for an explanation of matters, he relates his story as follows :—

" On the preparation, about the tenth hour, you locked me up, and I remained all the Sabbath. And at midnight, as I was standing and praying, the room where you locked me in was hung up by the four corners, and I saw a light like lightning [coming] into my eyes.

And I was afraid and fell to the ground. And some one took me by the hand, and removed me from the place where I had fallen; and moisture of water was poured from my head, even to my feet, and a smell of perfume came to my nostrils. And he wiped my face, and kissed me, and said to me, Fear not, Joseph, open thine eyes and see who it is that speaks to thee. And, looking up, I saw Jesus. And I trembled and thought it was a phantom; and I said the commandments. And he said to me, Even so thou art not ignorant that a phantom, if it meet anybody and hear the commandments, takes to flight. And seeing that he said them with me, I said unto him, Rabbi Helias! And he said unto me, I am not Helias. And I said to him, Who art thou, Lord? And he said to me, I am Jesus, whose body thou didst beg from Pilate, and thou didst clothe me with clean linen, and didst put a napkin on my face, and didst lay me in the new tomb, and didst roll a great stone to the door of the tomb. And I said to him who was speaking to me, Show me the place where I laid thee. And he carried me away, and showed me the place where I laid him, and the linen cloth was lying in it, and the napkin for his face. And I knew that it was Jesus. And he took me by the hand, and placed me, though the doors were locked, in the middle of my house, and led me away to my bed, and said to me, Peace [be] to thee. And he kissed me and said to me, For forty days go not forth out of thy house; for behold I go to my brethren into Galilee."

The Council thereupon fell to the ground, and "became as dead." After fasting they are exhorted by Nicodemus to go home. They resolve, however, to send for the three men who had seen Jesus in Galilee. These come to Jerusalem, and again testify to the fact. Asked further about His Ascension, they describe it. The council then agree that the matter is very wonderful,

but Annas and Caiaphas maintain, in spite of all the evidence, the condemnation of Jesus.[1]

7. Lastly, there is an Apocryphal work, existing in a Georgian translation,[2] which, according to Harnack, belongs to the fifth or sixth century. In this we are told that Joseph of Arimathæa, while in prison, was the first to see Jesus, who appeared to him.

[1] In the Latin version, Annas and Caiaphas give way; but, in A, they beg Pilate to keep their confession secret; while in B, utterly crushed, they unrepentantly await God's punishment.

[2] *Von Dobschütz in z .f. Kirchengesch.* 23, 1-7 (1902); also *S. B. A. W.*, 1901, pp. 920-931.

APPENDIX B

THE WATCH AT THE SEPULCHRE

Matt. xxvii. 62-66

THE historicity of this incident is impugned by Schmiedel (§ 5) on the following grounds :—

(*a*) It is entirely excluded by the women's question in Mark xvi. 3, ' Who shall roll us away the stone from the door of the tomb ? '

" They have no apprehension of the Watch ; only about the stone."

(*b*) It is improbable that the Jews remembered any prophecy of Jesus that He was to rise again in three days. These prophecies were made only to the innermost circle of His disciples. Even the women did not remember them, otherwise they would not have set out to anoint the body.

(*c*) The explanation suggested by the priests and elders is untenable : if the soldiers were asleep, they could not testify that the disciples stole the body.

(*d*) It is unlikely that the Jewish authorities would believe the (alleged) story of the soldiers. They would more likely have moved Pilate to make a strict inquiry into their conduct than have sought to bribe them.

(*e*) The soldiers cannot have alleged they were asleep, for they well knew that the penalty of sleeping upon a watch was death — always rigorously enforced.

(*f*) *The Gospel of Peter* (which is a later narrative) states it differently, viz., that the soldiers witnessed Jesus leaving the tomb.

None of the above objections, when carefully examined, seem of very great weight. For, it might be urged :—

(*a*) That the priests did not apply to Pilate for a watch until after sunset on the Sabbath. This is distinctly implied, if not stated, in xxvii. 62. Further, the matter would certainly be arranged *privately*, in the hope of catching the disciples *flagrante delicto*, and gaining credit thereby with the people. If the watch were set on the Saturday evening after dark (the eve of the critical time), neither the women nor the disciples would know that the watch was there, if they came early on the morning of the third day.

(*b*) This argument is very questionable. According to Matt. xii. 39, 40, and John ii. 19, certain of these predictions were made *publicly*. The former writer, indeed, says the prediction formed part of an answer to the Scribes and Pharisees, when they asked for a 'sign.'[1] The disciples, it is true, seem not to have grasped the meaning of these figurative statements until after the Resurrection, and the application was plain. The women too were probably not present at the public discourses of Jesus, and so would not hear the predictions.

(*c*) The story of the soldiers that the body had been *stolen*, would probably be the only *inference*, and certainly the only *excuse* possible, under such circumstances. They might also think that it had been removed by some magical arts ;

[1] Jon. ii. 2 speaks of the interior of the sea-monster as '*the belly of Sheôl*' (בֶּטֶן שְׁאוֹל), corresponding to the καρδίᾳ τῆς γῆς ('*the heart of the earth*') here. This highly symbolical reference, while probably not understood by the disciples, and crowd generally, would be quite intelligible to the Scribes and Pharisees, who were accustomed to this figurative kind of teaching, and would doubtless take note of it.

but they could hardly *report* such a conclusion. And it is especially to be noted that in no account do they say that they saw it being taken away.

(*d*) It is probable (assuming the truth of the story) that the Jewish authorities would hardly know what to think or do. Judging from Luke xi. 18 and similar passages, they might assume dæmoniacal agencies at work. Further, from their knowledge of the mood they had a short time before left Pilate in (cp. Matt. xxvii. 24; John xix. 21, 22), it is unlikely that they would be encouraged to trouble him again, and probably meet with a further rebuff. It might be added, too, that men who have embarked upon a shifty and dishonest policy are always more prone to such expedients as bribery than to strict inquiry.

(*e*) Here the soldiers would have practically no other alternative than to trust to the good offices of the priests. The body (we will suppose) was *gone*, and their negligence in *any* case would (under ordinary circumstances) be punishable by death (cp. Acts xii. 19). If the priests could persuade Pilate that the removal had been effected by some dæmoniacal agency, and that the men were really not to blame, it is not improbable that Pilate, who seems not to have been naturally a cruel man, would gladly take advantage of the opportunity of hushing up the matter, inasmuch as he was heartily tired of it. The delinquencies, if any, of a watch, sent to comply with the whims of some Jewish priests, and the delinquencies of a watch on Roman military duty, would be two entirely different matters.

(*f*) The Gospel of Peter endeavours to bring in the evidence of the watch in a legendary sort of fashion. Matthew states the whole matter with much more reserve and probability, disdaining

entirely such fictitious embellishments. This tells in favour of Matthew's veracity.

Indeed the strongest evidence against this incident is the fact that it has so little corroborative support. The guard is referred to nowhere else except in the *Gospel of Peter,* and (possibly) in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews.* In view of the probable high antiquity of the latter, and the early date of the basis of Matthew, it seems that there was a very primitive tradition respecting a watch. But whether this is altogether historical, especially in its details, it is now extremely difficult to say.

In any case, however, the present story, in its main outlines, does not seem intrinsically improbable.

NOTE.—It is generally assumed that Matthew means it to be understood that the guard referred to consisted of *Roman* soldiers, This is, however, by no means certain. The priests had a Jewish Temple guard, which would probably not be allowed by the Romans to discharge any duties outside those precincts. Pilate's reply, therefore, which may read either, " Take a guard," or " *Ye have a guard* " (a polite form of refusal, if the request was for Roman soldiers), may be understood in either sense. If the guard were Jewish it would explain the fact that Pilate overlooked the negligence. Ver. 14, however, seems against this view, unless Pilate might be supposed to have some jurisdiction over even a Jewish guard when employed outside the Temple.

Hilgenfeld (*Zeitschr.* p. 72) thinks that it was a Jewish watch and not a Roman one. His opinion seems to be largely based upon the fragmentary narrative in the *Gospel according to the Hebrews,* where the reference to the servant of the priest being present, is more consonant with the guard being Jewish than Roman.

The *Gospel of Peter,* it will be noted, makes the guard to be composed of both Roman soldiers and Jewish priests and elders, etc.

APPENDIX C

CRITICAL THEORIES OF THE RESURRECTION

1. *The Swoon Theory.*

The chief advocate of this now practically obsolete theory was Dr Paulus (1828).[1] It was also supported by Bunsen, Venturini, Bahrdt, and, to some extent, by Schleiermacher. It has been revived in this country more recently by Voysey,[2] and the author of *Supernatural Religion* appears to favour it.

According to this view, Jesus did not die upon the cross, He only fainted, and subsequently recovered under the influence of the myrrh and aloes in the cool rock-hewn vault. Then, "white-robed adherents, perhaps Essenes, opened his grave,[3] and he left the place of the dead in gardener's clothes, which happened to be at hand. After the exertions of the first day, he kept himself more private, and rested and nursed his fatigued body, during which time his unknown coadjutors undertook the duties of guardians and providers.

After he had from time to time left his unknown asylum, and had appeared in disguise to his followers here and there from Galilee to Jerusalem, at last, when he found that the feverish wasting of his strength was increasing, in order to spare his followers the sight of the dissolution of his earthly nature, perhaps also in order to die, like Moses and Apollonius, without witnesses, he took his farewell on the Mount of Olives when a

[1] *Das Leben Jesu*, p. 277; *Exegetisches Handbuch*, p. 929.

[2] *The Swoon Theory*, C. Voysey.

[3] Strauss thinks He crawled out of the pit into which, along with the two thieves, His body had been thrown.

cloud did him the service of snatching his person from the eyes of the assembled company." [1]

Keim thinks that "the strongest point of this theory is the absence of formal proof of death, and the abstract possibility of a subsequent return to life and consciousness."

It might be added that they are the only points which can be urged in its favour. Even if we grant an abnormal initial vitality, there were a number of circumstances which tended to exhaust this—the Agony in the Garden, the arrest at midnight, the brutal treatment in the hall of the High Priest's palace and at the prætorium of Pilate, the exhausting journeys backwards and forwards between Pilate and Herod, the terrible Roman scourging, the journey to Calvary, during which He fell exhausted by the strain upon His powers, the agonizing torture of the Crucifixion, and the thirst and feverishness which followed. It would be difficult to imagine even the most powerful of men, after enduring all these, not succumbing to death. Moreover, it is recorded that the victims of crucifixion seldom recovered, even under the most favourable circumstances.[2]

We cannot state the insuperable objections to this theory better than in the words of two able modern critics :—

"Then," says Keim," [3] there is the most impossible thing of all; the poor, weak, sick Jesus, with difficulty holding himself erect, in hiding, disguised, and finally dying—this Jesus an object of faith, of exalted emotion, of the triumph of his adherents, a risen conqueror, and Son of God! Here, in fact, the theory begins to grow paltry, absurd, worthy only of rejection."

[1] Keim's summary of theory of Paulus: *Jesus of Nazara*, vol. vi. pp. 327-8; Bunsen, *L. J.* pp. 434 ff., 474. Both he and Venturini believed that Jesus lived in obscurity afterwards.

[2] Josephus, *Vit.* 75.

[3] *Jesus of Nazara*, vol. vi. p. 330.

"At the present day," says Weiss,[1] "it is not worth while to dissolve this phantasy, destitute of all historical meaning, in the destruction of which Strauss earned his laurels as a critic."

2. *The Vision Theory.*

This, in its older form, is the theory of Strauss and Renan, and was advocated in England chiefly by Martineau. Keim says of it,[2] "Long before Strauss and Renan, indeed exactly seventeen hundred years ago, the ancient opponent Celsus[3] had transferred the myth of the resurrection to this inner domain, and had published the supposition that Mary of Magdala—a woman who had been 'possessed'—and with her this one or that out of the Company possessing a peculiar mental character, favoured the world with a dream-vision, or with a fancy of her own coining—and this pleased him best—with an intentional lie. Nothing more need be said about this last supposition, for it is too paltry, and has been already referred to. . . . For many centuries the vision hypothesis had no success, and it was rejected by Origen himself. In recent times it has been in a certain sense held by Spinoza, who found in the narrative of the resurrection this truth, namely, that there came to the disciples in these appearances, which were accommodated to their understandings by the condescending action of God,[4] the knowledge of the spiritual resurrection of Jesus from the dead through the example of his sanctity in life and death. But whilst the critics on the Rationalistic side did not hesitate to adopt such an explanation in the case of the vision seen by the Apostle Paul—in which case it is more urgently required—yet, as to the life of Jesus, it

[1] *New Life of Jesus.* Neander and Renan also insist on the reality of the death and the absurdity of this theory.

[2] *Jesus of Nazara,* vol. vi. p. 331.

[3] *Contr. Cels.* of Origen.

[4] Keim is here referring to his own 'telegram-theory.' See 4.

was emphatically rejected by critics from Dr Paulus and Venturini to Schleiermacher. Paulus said that the most active, and most righteous suspicion could find no trace of phantasmal illusion here."

Keim thinks, however, that this theory is " very much strengthened by the obvious difficulty of conceiving of a corporeal resurrection " ; and because " resurrections of dead men appearing on earth are to be found only in mythical stories." But, he asks subsequently, " with all these supports to the modern theory, was it really possible for the Apostles in their situation, to arrive at this revulsion, this escape, this glad belief that Jesus lived, this ecstatic view of the dead as living ? A unanimous cry of ' Impossible ! ' comes from the opponents of the theory, even from Weisse and Fichte, Holtzmann and Weizsäcker : the Apostles, in their dejection, in their hopelessness, in their utter mental paralysis, could not possibly, without higher help, have risen to such a triumphant faith and sight, assertion and action. Even Strauss acknowledges [1] that the conversion of Paul, and the formation of the picture of the living, glorified Christ before his eyes, could be much more easily brought about as after-products of the already attested life, than could the first production in the Apostles of the visionary picture of Jesus as living again, after the annihilation of his being and his cause."

In England, Dr Martineau, who holds to this theory, argues [2] that the first faith of the disciples was independent of any material evidence. He maintains that Jesus could not die in the minds of His disciples. He was always living to them, and they invented, more or less consciously, the external material evidence to support their inward and spiritual belief. " The hovering of interest about the tomb," he says, " is the incipient

[1] Cp. Strauss, *New Life of Jesus*, ii. pp. 635 ff., 4th Ed.
[2] *Seat of Authority in Religion*, p. 370.

materializing of the first faith." This, in fact, is the starting-point of his visionary hypothesis.

But the Narratives in the Gospels state the exact opposite of this. There is not a shred of evidence to show that the disciples, or the women, believed that He was risen before they saw Him alive. Keim, in a long and closely-reasoned passage,[1] shows the untenability of this theory. "It is contradicted," he says, "by the evidently simple, solemn, almost lifeless, cold, unfamiliar character of the manifestations." They are "orderly, regular" Appearances, and cease at an early period. But, "the visionary piety of the Montanists (A.D. 120) filled half-a-century with its multiform follies."

To meet this serious difficulty some supporters of the theory have asserted a similar duration of the Appearances; and even Renan speaks of "a full year of uninterrupted visions, or feverish intoxication, which Magdalene, the creator of God, furnished to the world."

But, "there was no host of appearances, no exuberance, no indescribable irregularity, no violent transition." There were, indeed, "a few repetitions, since Peter, alone and with the others, saw the Lord four times, the Apostles saw him thrice, while, on the other hand, the five hundred saw him but once, and James once." "These repetitions are no confirmation of the theory, but its refutation; because, with the repetition of the self-generated vision, the facility, the tendency, the intensity, must grow far beyond the production of a fourfold, or a threefold vision."

Finally, there comes the end of them; "not one of the five hundred repeats the ecstasy, and all the cases of ecstasy irrevocably end with the fifth vision. What a contradiction of high swollen enthusiasm, and of sudden ebb, even to the point of disappearance. Just

[1] *Jesus of Nazara*, vi. pp. 354-358.

when fervid minds are beginning to grow fanatical, the fanaticism absolutely and entirely ceases. It might be possible that a few less ardent natures . . . would quickly recover their mental equilibrium; but in the greater number of the twelve, and of the five hundred, a movement which had burst the dams would certainly not be stayed in an instant; and yet the narrative says nothing of a third vision to the twelve, and nothing of a second to the five hundred."

With such unanswerable objections does Keim help to dispose of the fiction of subjectively caused visions.[1]

3. *The Apparition Theory.*[2]

This differs from the vision theory in a fundamental particular; modern spiritualists do not regard the Appearances of Jesus as mere hallucinations, *i.e.* visions created in the minds of the disciples without any corresponding external reality. Their view is based upon the alleged fact that after the death and burial of the physical body, its "*astral*" *counterpart* lingers about the place of burial and sometimes other neighbourhoods also. These forms are occasionally seen by various people, especially highly sensitive 'clairvoyants.' This theory, therefore, asserts that Jesus actually appeared, not in the body that was placed in the tomb of Joseph, but as a *spirit-form*[3] only.

The actual body, perhaps, underwent a rapid process of dissolution into the ultimate and invisible constituents of matter. The fact of an empty tomb would necessitate some such agency as this at work.

Among the arguments brought forward to support this hypothesis, may be mentioned the fact that Mary Magdalene mistook Him for the gardener, and His non-recognition at Emmaus. Also, it is stated, that He

[1] For a critique of the theory in its most recent form, see chapters x. and xi

[2] This theory is also further discussed in chapter xi.

[3] Perhaps "materialized" through some mediumistic agency present.

could pass in and out through closed doors, and appear and disappear instantaneously.[1]

A very serious objection to this theory, however, is to be found in the words of Jesus recorded in Luke xxiv. 39. And setting aside the *quæstio vexata* as to whether all reported apparitions are either mere hallucinations or else frauds upon the credulity of those who witness them, it is difficult to see how such a manifestation could have supplied the hopes and powers in the minds of the disciples which enabled them to achieve such great results. The mere appearance of a phantom—whether 'materialized' or not—has never stimulated mankind to achieve anything really important, much less inspired them to undertake such a gigantic work as was begun by the first disciples, and carried on afterwards by successive generations of Christians.

4. *The "Telegram" Theory.*

This hypothesis is a combination of the Vision and Apparition Theories. We will state it in the author's own words.[2]

"If the visions are not something humanly generated or self-generated, if they are not blossom and fruit of an illusion producing over excitement, if they are not something strange and mysterious, if they are directly accompanied by astonishingly clear perceptions and resolves, then there still remains one originating source, namely God and the glorified Christ.

"Spinoza incidentally expresses this opinion; and those recent critics who are as little satisfied with the mythical as with the visionary, have reverted to this assumption of a higher power, of a divine impulsion, or of a continued interposition of the glorified person of

[1] Further details of this theory may be found in Dr Crowell's *Primitive Christianity and Modern Spiritualism.*

[2] Keim, *Jesus of Nazara,* vi. pp. 361 ff. See also chapter x.

Jesus. The glorified Christ has been decisively mentioned by Weisse, and after him by Seydel, and Fichte has spoken still better of a spiritual influence of Jesus, who continued to live on in a higher form of existence, an influence which, according to the law of the eccentric projection of overpowering soul impressions embodied itself in ocular visions. Unless we arbitrarily introduce into the reports a fresh element, the production of the appearances is to be ascribed not to God, but to him whose presence was observed.

"Again, unless, contrary to all facts, and all ideas upon the subject, we fall back upon corporeal appearances of spirits, such as in a truly popular way Celsus speaks of and Weisse favours, a sharp division must be made between objective influence and subjectively visionary figures. If it be objected that the difficulties of the vision-theory are thus in a weakened form renewed, that the subjective self-engendering of the vision would only somewhat differently introduce all that excitement and tendency to repetition, which the vision-theory asserts, but which the facts exclude, that nothing but the most delicate susceptibility of the disciples, in other words, the recognition of the exclusive action of Jesus, whether corporeal or incorporeal, in the vision, would explain the speedy cessation of the vision-seeing, the rapid transition to sober thinking: it can be replied that, if the power that produces the vision comes, as according to our view it does, entirely from without, and the subjective seeing is merely the reflex-form of what is objective, the immediate cessation of the seeing, and of the will to see, as soon as the operating power ceases to operate becomes perfectly intelligible.

For the rest, this question at least, the question whether Jesus directly, or only indirectly, supplied the form of the vision, is of a subordinate character; and even the corporeal appearance may be granted to those who are afraid of losing everything unless they

have this plastic representation for their thought and their faith."

As this theory has already been discussed in the text of this work, it will suffice here to say that it does not seem to satisfy any school of critics. The objective-vision hypothesis, whether in this form or any other, fails to satisfy the impressions of *reality*, which the Appearances undoubtedly produced upon the minds of the disciples.

5. *Theories of Fraud.* (*a*) *Theft of Body.*

According to Matthew,[1] the Jewish authorities circulated the report that the body of Jesus had been stolen by His disciples in the night. And that this explanation was really current amongst the Jews of a somewhat later time is evidenced by the statements of Justin Martyr, Tertullian, and others.

In Justin's *Dial. c. Tryph.* 108, the Jew speaks of "one Jesus, a Galilean deceiver, whom we crucified; but his disciples stole him by night from the tomb, where he was laid when unfastened from the cross, and now deceive men by asserting that he has risen from the dead and ascended into heaven." So also Tertullian (*Apol.* 21) says: "The grave was found empty of all but the clothes of the buried one. But, nevertheless, the leaders of the Jews, whom it nearly concerned both to spread abroad a lie, and keep back a people tributary and submissive to them from the faith, gave it out that the body of Christ had been stolen by his followers." And, again, with a fine scorn he says,[2] "This is he whom his disciples secretly stole away that it might be said that he had risen again, or the gardener had taken away, in order that his lettuces might not be damaged by the crowds of visitors!"

This statement we find repeated in Jewish mediæval literature.[3] Reimarus repeats the same story: "The

[1] xxviii. 13.

[2] *De Spectac.* 30.

[3] Jewish book in Eisenmenger, i. pp. 189 ff., etc.

disciples of Jesus," he says, "purloined the body of Jesus before it had been buried twenty-four hours, played at the burial-place the comedy of the empty grave, and delayed the public announcement of the resurrection until the fiftieth day, when the decay of the body had become complete."

The statements and arguments of this very old theory were fully answered by Origen. He says (*Contr. Cels.* i. 31)—"One may well wonder how it happened that the disciples, if—as the detractors of Jesus say—they did not see him after his resurrection from the dead, and were not persuaded of his divinity, were not afraid to endure the same sufferings with their Master, and to expose themselves to danger, and to leave their native country to teach, according to the wish of Jesus, the doctrines delivered to them by him. For I think that no one who candidly examines the facts would say that these men devoted themselves to a life of danger, for the sake of the doctrine of Jesus, without a profound conviction, which he wrought in their minds of its truth, not only teaching them to conform to his precepts, but others also, and to conform, moreover, when manifest destruction of life impended over him who ventured to introduce these new opinions into all places, and before all audiences, and who could retain as his friend no human being who adhered to the former opinions and usages."

This reply is virtually the argument adopted by Paley in his well-known *Evidences of Christianity*, and is a full and sufficient answer to any charge of fraud against the disciples.

(*b*) *Conspiracy Theory.*—This, mainly an English invention, is set forth at some length in a book entitled *The Real Jesus: a Review of His Life and Death from a Jewish Standpoint.*[1]

The writer believes that Jesus was merely a tool in the hands of a number of conspirators. "He was," he says,

[1] By John Vickers, borrowing from Venturini.

"no more an independent revelator than his disciples were; he was clearly instigated and moved by others, who would, of course, enjoin secrecy upon him; his whole line of conduct affords evidence of his being a credulous zealot, schooled by objective visions." The motives of these supposed conspirators are thus explained:[1]—

"The Jews of that period, who believed in the coming 'Kingdom of Heaven,' seem to have thought, that with certain dramatic preparations and fulfilments of Scripture many others would be brought to believe, and that the predicted events would thus be accelerated. It was needful, in their estimation, that the suffering nation should have a suffering Messiah, who must die as a martyr, and rise again in appearance, foretokening the general resurrection. And it was not by mere persuasion and argument that a pious Galilean peasant would be led to believe that he was the Messiah specially pointed to in the Scripture, and was required to undertake a mission which would involve the laying down of his life."

In order to carry out this plan, the conspirators impressed upon the mind of Jesus that, if He laid down His life He would rise again in three days.

Mr Vickers then proceeds to explain: "The real head of the sect, Joseph of Arimathæa, and others[2] who had secret intercourse with him, had an obvious reason for predicting this, as though it had been revealed from heaven, that he might the more readily devote himself to martyrdom, and his disciples be the more disposed at the appointed time to believe in the projected miracle of the Resurrection."

When Jesus had been encouraged to suffer death, under the belief that He was thus fulfilling Scripture, and would most surely rise again, they proceeded to

[1] P. 220.

[2] Must we suppose that Caiaphas was one of them? Cp. John xi. 50.

bring about the drama of the Crucifixion. We are then further enlightened, as follows :—

" There can be little doubt that the same secret chiefs of the Nazarene sect who got up the mountain-vision,[1] and spoke of the martyrdom which he was soon to suffer, were really instrumental to its accomplishment. They had, under the guise of messengers from heaven, directed their Messianic devotee to go up to Jerusalem, and there to die, and to rise again according to the Scriptures ; and now they had arrived within the city they laboured craftily and assiduously for the completion of their design."

This, it seems, " was to them simply the getting up of a masked drama to impose on the world ; they stood behind the scenes, and commanded the whole of the movements ; they had only to engage a number of people to act certain parts to do this, that, and the other things, for a small payment, as they directed, and the religious mystery was performed with entire success. Those who crucified Jesus and mocked and insulted him, no more acted from natural impulse than do their modern imitators in the Bavarian Passion Play.[2] They did as they were told, just to fulfil scripture, and produce a strong impression on the minds of the spectators ; the whole story is dramatic, coloured to some little extent with mythical embellishments." [3]

The Resurrection is thus explained : the conspirators get possession of the body of Jesus, since they " had the placing of the Roman watch at the sepulchre . . . and it was a prudent and well-arranged measure." Further : " It might naturally seem advisable to them, under these circumstances, to place a guard at the sepulchre to keep away all impertinent and hostile intruders. And who could be more fitted for such a

[1] *I.e.* the Transfiguration.

[2] It would seem that Pontius Pilate was also a " conspirator " !

[3] *The Real Jesus*, etc., p. 238.

task than their late hired assistants, the Roman soldiers, who had so well acted their part of fulfilling prophecy at the crucifixion? Moreover, by getting a military guard placed at the tomb for the ostensible purpose of preventing the expected fraudulent resurrection, it might tend to lull suspicion, to quiet and satisfy those who were really apprehensive of a secret abstraction of the body, and who might otherwise have deemed it necessary to be present and watch for themselves." [1]

When matters were thus arranged, and the watch had returned to their quarters, the conspirators came to the tomb, and, "whilst it was dark," "secretly bore away the body." The details of the scheme are thus explained by the author. In the first place they posted "some of their party at the sepulchre, when the body was abstracted, to start the report that Jesus had actually risen from the dead, and was gone into Galilee to the place where he had appointed to meet them." But, "they would not think of carrying off and concealing the dead prophet of Nazareth without providing a living representative to go forth in his place, and fulfil the prediction of his rising. In order to complete their resurrection drama, it would be necessary for one of the confederacy to personate the revived Jesus before some of the leading disciples, as they had on a former occasion personated Moses and Elias in Galilee. Accordingly we find in the Gospel narrative an account of a mysterious visitor presenting himself to a few privileged beholders in that character. It is generally supposed that this person who obtruded himself on the notice of the disciples occasionally, soon after the evacuation of the sepulchre, was believed by them to be Jesus, on the ground of his perfect identity in form and feature with their late Master." [2]

The disciples accepted "this living representative" because "they were fully prepared and confidently

[1] P. 242. [2] P. 247.

looking (Jn. xx. 9) for their revived Master before anyone in that character made his appearance. They probably at first did not expect to meet him until they had arrived at the mountain in Galilee ; but when they found that the sepulchre was empty, heard that he had risen, and that he had been seen alive in the neighbourhood, their minds would not fail to become excited, and their eyes would have been ready to anticipate his appearance in the form of every stranger who approached them.[1] When, therefore, a personator of Jesus did actually present himself, a few weak circumstantial evidences [2] that he was armed with, sufficed to convince them of his identity." [3]

Then we are told that this "living representative," when recognized by the two disciples at Emmaus, in some way (not explained) "vanished out of sight." The difficulty with the Crucifixion wounds is also got over by simply pronouncing them "a mythical embellishment by the Gospel writers." And, indeed, all other inconvenient evidence in the Gospels, the author would get rid of by the process of excision. Finally, he asks, "Where is the actual resurrection ?" And his answer is, "It seems to have been much such a miracle as the transmutation which now takes place occasionally under the box of the conjurer ; the people who stand as spectators are permitted to see the dead thing which goes in, and the live thing which comes out ; and having these few intimations and suggestions of a miracle given them, are expected to imagine and believe the rest." [4]

This theory, just detailed, which is both uncritical and absurd, is open to the same general reply as the last—men do not stake their lives on so transparent a lie, nor to bear witness to any 'transmutation' such as takes place in 'the box of the conjurer.' The really extraordinary thing here is, that any reasonable person

[1] But see Matt. xxviii. 17.
[2] See Luke xxiv. 39, etc.
[3] *Ibid.* p. 251.
[4] *Ibid.* p. 259.

can be found to support so crude and ridiculous a hypothesis.

6. *Theory of Roman Interference.*—In the *Hibbert Journal* for April 1906, Mr T. W. Rolleston, in a Dialogue upon the Resurrection of Christ, propounds a theory which has the merit of some originality. The *Dialogi Personæ* are *Stephen,* a Roman Catholic, and *Oliver,* "an educated man of the post-Darwinian epoch."

They discuss the question while returning home from High Mass to which *Stephen* has taken *Oliver.* On coming to the Story of the Watch at the tomb, the author thus proceeds :—

"*Oliver.* . . . Now most of this, whoever wrote it, is obviously a piece of fanciful invention. The Evangelist was certainly not in the secret councils of the Pharisees and the Roman Procurator. Nor can we imagine that the Pharisees and soldiers, in presence of a stupendous miracle, in which they fully believed, would have remained wholly unaffected by it, or would have supposed that they could hush it up, and nullify it by a little bribery.

"Again, you will notice that the Jews are represented as having laid hold of Christ's predictions of his Resurrection, though his disciples are supposed to have been wholly unimpressed by them till after the event. The kernel of the story is most probably true, and this is the fact that Roman soldiers were on guard at the tomb. Why were they there ? Matthew's explanation of their presence is evidently fanciful. The real explanation, I submit, is something quite different. The Jews had nothing to do with them. The soldiers were charged by their own authorities to open the tomb and remove the body, for the very same object as that for which Lord Kitchener lately destroyed the Mahdi's remains in the Sudan—that they might not become a centre of veneration, and thus start a new cult, having as its object

a man whom the law had executed as a malefactor. How very probable a course was this for Pilate to take, and how strongly does the mention of the Roman soldiers at the tomb, with the story so remarkably lacking in coherence and verisimilitude, which was invented to account for them, confirm this view.

"Stephen. But surely Christ the authorities delayed their own ends by secrecy! The Priests in the Sedan rifled the Mahdi's tomb with all the publicity possible. And why did not the Romans tell the story when the new cult actually had arisen?"

"Quinn. Well, we cannot entirely clear away the haze which hangs over the transaction. But the Romans were notoriously disinclined to shock the feelings of alien races in sacred matters, such as the disposal of the dead. They probably never anticipated that a resurrection myth would grow up around the empty tomb. They no doubt took for granted that the Christians would accuse the Jews of the sacrilege, and that in the absence of any proof of anything, the whole affair would blow over after a little wrangling, and sink like an echo of dust at a street corner. By the time it had revived in a really serious form, and forced itself on the authorities then in power,[1] all knowledge and record of the true facts would have been lost. The close secrecy of the proceedings would itself assure that. Meanwhile, I may point out that the empty tomb, the great objective fact of the situation, as you have called it, if it did not start the resurrection myth, would have been quite enough to secure that the myth, however started, would speedily take the form of a *physical* resurrection."

This theory, chiefly remarkable for the fact that it takes for granted exactly what most modern negative critics entirely deny—the Empty Tomb and the Story of the Watch—is not difficult to dispose of.

[1] Pilate's governorship ended A.D. 36, when three years after

In the first place it makes no attempt even to explain the fact of the Appearances, so thoroughly attested by various witnesses. The hypothesis of the Roman dread of some new cult springing up, is also a mere figment of the author's mind. Pilate, it is abundantly evident, thoroughly despised the whole action of the priests as founded upon mere jealousy and a contemptible religious squabble. Indeed, it would seem more probable that he would rather have rejoiced in the prospect of future trouble and annoyance to the instigators of the crime. And had he removed the body as supposed here, it cannot be doubted that some official record of the fact would have been kept.

Neither was there, at Rome, such opposition and hostility to new cults, as Mr Rolleston assumes. The tradition that Tiberius wrote a letter to the Senate suggesting the incorporation of Jesus as a new god in the Roman pantheon, and the placing of His bust on the Capitol, is probably untrue; but it is none the less an accurate description of Roman policy in such matters. Viewed from the Roman standpoint, the spiritual kingdom of Jesus meant nothing which concerned them. Pilate would feel that an awkward prisoner had been got rid of—possibly in an unjust manner—and there was the end of the matter.

And, lastly, we cannot doubt that the priests would not have regarded *any* report the guard might make as 'a stupendous miracle,' which could not be denied. This is a modern conception entirely. The soldiers themselves would have looked upon it as the effect of some mysterious wizardry; the priests would have explained it away, as they did the miracles, by reference to the agency of evil spirits. Such an occurrence, in fact, would convince neither party.

7. *The Mythological Theory.*—The original mythical theory was formulated by Strauss (1835 A.D.), who then

maintained that the Gospel Narratives were the form in which the philosophical and poetical tendencies of the time and the Old Testament Messianic expectations, were crystallized in the first two centuries. It has been revived of late years in a new form, under the impulse given by Assyriological studies, by Winckler and others, and adopted in England by Dr Cheyne, who thus states the theory.[1]

"The Apostle Paul, when he says (1 Cor. xv. 3, 4) that Christ died, and that he rose again 'according to the Scriptures,' in reality points to a pre-Christian sketch of the life of Christ, partly . . . derived from widely spread non-Jewish myths, and embodied in Jewish writings.[2] May we hold that the statement 'three days and three nights' was taken from one such myth, and the statement 'two days,' (implied in 'on the third day'), from another?[3] And, to account for the three days, may we suppose that this specification is merely a modification of the three months, *i.e.* that it meant originally the period of winter? . . .

"But I think that we are bound to look further, and seek for another solution which will adequately account for the 'three days.' May not Prof. Winckler be right in supposing that the three days were borrowed from another myth relative to the moon-god, and that originally they were the days during which, near the time of the new moon in spring, the moon becomes invisible?[4]

"The same scholar is also of opinion that the 40 days

[1] See *Bible Problems*, pp. 113 ff. It may be added here that Strauss later on, in his *New Life of Jesus*, abandoned the Mythical for the Vision hypothesis.

[2] He refers (p. 253) to Matt. xxvi. 54, 56; 2 Esdr. vii. 29; Isa. liii. 5, 7, 8; Zech. xii. 10, and "the death of the solar deity Marduk" (Zimmern, *K.A.T.*, 3rd Ed. p. 371); also the death of Osiris and other Egyptian gods, (Maspero, *Dawn of Civilization*), cp. "the empty grave of Zeus, pointed out in Crete." Also, Hos. vi. 2; but Jon. i. 17 would certainly not justify St Paul's expression 'on the third day.'

[3] *Christianity and Mythology*, J. M. Robertson.

[4] *Geschichte Israels*, ii. 84; cp. Zimmern, *op. cit.*, pp. 362, 366, 384, 389.

between the Resurrection and the Ascension of Christ, may originally (*i.e.* in a pre-Christian myth, out of which the Jewish and Christian representations grew), have meant the forty days during which, as the ancients well knew, the Pleiades became invisible.[1]

"In this case, the forty days of the evangelical tradition were properly the interval between the death and the resurrection of Christ; *i.e.* from a purely archæological point of view, the Resurrection and the Ascension were one and the same thing.[2] In fact, the resurrection and ascension of the solar heroes were naturally identical, and the archæological theory here expounded is, that myths of solar deities supplied details for the close of that story of the Messiah, which, according to a highly satisfying theory, preceded the appearance of the Christ of history. . . ."

"I hold, then,[3] that the form of the statement of our Lord's Resurrection does, from an archæological point of view, appear to be of mythic origin. But this is far from exhausting my meaning. As a student of religion, I distinguish between the *form of the truth* that is believed, and the *very truth itself*. I lay no small stress upon this; but I must not say more at present, because I have first to mention those mythic stories of resurrection, with which the *outward* form of the Gospel Narratives of the Resurrection of Christ must inevitably be compared.

"Here, as in other cases, it is highly important to limit our field of investigation. Our instances shall be taken from Babylonia, Egypt, Phœnicia, and Phrygia.

"The Babylonian deity of the spring-tide sun (Marduk), who died, also rose again;[4] his chief festival went by the name of the 'standing-up' (*tabû*).

[1] Cp. *Ency. Bibl.* 4781. [2] But cp. Acts i. 3. [3] P. 118.

[4] The myth of his resurrection is merely *inferred* from the fact that his grave was *said* to have been shown in Babylonia. Another form of Marduk is the Babylonian god Asari, who has been identified by Sayce and Ball with the Egyptian Osiris, whose resurrection myth is one of the most elaborate known (see *Hibbert Lectures*, Sayce, p. 231, note).

"It was the festival of the New Year at the time of the vernal equinox. Resurrection, too, enters into the elaborate Egyptian myth of Osiris, who after a violent death lived on (as the sun of yesterday lives on in the sun of to-day) in the person of his son Horus. Adonis and Attis also were said to have revived after death, and, like Osiris and Marduk, were honoured by yearly festivals.

"Surely it must be clear (1) that the view presented of the possible origin of this form of belief is not exposed to the objections raised to the various vision-hypotheses; and (2) that the hold which the bodily resurrection of Jesus Christ obtained upon the Church can now be plausibly accounted for.

"Now, too, we can perhaps more easily account for the early Christian transformation of the sense of certain Old Testament passages, such as *Isa.* liii. 10, and *Ps.* xvi. 10. The transformation seems to have been unconsciously effected, and in the first instance by the Jews, to justify the belief in the Messiah's resurrection derived from a widespread mythic tradition. The Christians (see 1 Cor. xv. 4, and parallels) only followed the example of the Jews. It was natural that both Jews and Christians should look out for previsions of this great event in the Scriptures, the received interpretation of prophecy having become largely eschatological. . . . It is perfectly right to ask how the Christian faith is affected by this hypothesis. To this it may be frankly answered, that it is not affected at all. The discovery that a form of belief is of non-historical origin (*i.e.* belongs to another sphere than that of history) has nothing to do with the truth or falsehood of the belief itself. Whatever else can be subverted by criticism, the belief in the resurrection of Christ is safe. . . ."

Dr Cheyne subsequently continues:[1]—"Apart from all the theological formulations, it remains true to the Christian that One who was in such close and constant

[1] P. 126.

communion with God, and had such keen spiritual insight, and such potent spiritual influence, could not become like a quenched lamp, or be reduced to the shadowy negative existence assigned to the departed by the later Jews. Those who draw the above necessary inference will naturally go on to regard the spiritual resurrection of Christ (which they also infer) as involving the spiritual resurrection of his followers, and at the same time as a symbol of the new moral life of redeemed humanity, and of each of its members. Others, however, will go still further, and affirm that a body is necessary to the integrity of human nature; from which they will infer the bodily Resurrection both of Christ and His followers. . . . How this is possible conscience cannot say. The favourite theory[1] that the human spirit after death will be free to organize a suitable spiritual body from its new environment, does not belong to the sphere of the conscience, which, however, by one of faith's inferences, may affirm the resurrection-body of Christ to have been suitably glorious, and to be typical of that of his true followers."

The above form of the Mythical Theory has been criticized in an able article in the *Contemporary Review*,[2] by the Rev. G. Margoliouth, who says :—

"Prof. Cheyne often uses somewhat problematical forms of speech; but he is at the same time careful to make his meaning perfectly clear by the general context of his remarks. He tells us, for instance, that 'whatever else can be subverted by criticism, the belief in the Resurrection of Christ is safe.' Prof. Cheyne means exactly what he says; but the reader must be careful to lay full stress on the word 'belief.' What, in his view, is safe is not *the resurrection* in any of the usual senses of the word, but the *belief* in it; and the belief in the resurrection merely means the Christian con-

[1] See Charles, *Ency. Bibl.*, Eschatology, § 99. [2] Nov. 1906.

sciousness, or, more generally speaking, the religious consciousness of immortality.

"The new theory expressed in our own words, but carefully gathered from different parts of the book, is in essence as follows:—'Christ's personality has indeed survived death, but there is no ground for believing that he was either objectively seen by the disciples after the Crucifixion, or even that the disciples imagined to have seen him. The accounts of Christ's Appearances after death, given in the Gospels, and other parts of the New Testament are absolutely unhistorical. Not even the least vestige of actual Appearances is to be granted as a demonstrated fact. What remains is the *belief*, engendered and enforced by the Christian consciousness, that Christ's personality continues to exist. How did this belief arise? Not in any sense whatsoever in the manner indicated in the New Testament, but in quite a different way. The ancient Babylonians had a mythical belief in the resurrection of Marduk, or some other form of the sun-god; the ancient Egyptians believed in the risen Osiris; the Phœnicians had their revived Adonis. Other races had similar beliefs. All these myths can be traced to the observed facts of the periodical weakening of the sun's rays, or its disappearance from the sky, followed by its reappearance, or renewal of light. This widely spread and almost universal nature-myth found its way into certain circles of Jews before the time of Christ, and may be assumed to have formed an important feature in a kind of pre-Christian Apocalyptic forecast of the Messiah that was to come. When the Christ of history had actually appeared, and, after His labours on earth, had died, this ancient resurrection-myth became, as a matter of course, incorporated into His history. This, and none other, is the true origin of the narratives of the resurrection. The Christian consciousness, pure and simple, would merely have led to a belief in the survival of Christ's personality; but

the mythical narratives of actual appearances became by force of circumstances the form in which this consciousness expressed itself.' "

It will be seen from the above summary that Dr Cheyne rejects entirely the subjective vision theory of Prof. Schmiedel.

Mr Margoliouth thus sums up his objections to this theory :[1]—

(1) This purely mythical hypothesis is indefensible from the *psychological* point of view.

(2) It is untenable on grounds of *literary and historical criticism.*

(3) The parallel which it seeks to establish between the various sun-myths, and the Resurrection of Christ fails to satisfy the *required conditions of the case.*

(1) The *Psychological* Objection.—" The Apostolic age," says Mr Margoliouth, " was clearly a time of great mental uplifting, and high religious enthusiasm. . . . But the new theory provides us with such a cut-and-dried view of things that the psychological factor becomes almost superfluous. The mythical hypothesis strikes us, in fact, as an impaired, instead of an improved, new edition of the old mechanical theory of prophetic fulfilment. With Isaiah and the other Hebrew prophets are now associated mythic solar traditions of Egypt, Babylonia, Phœnicia, and other parts of the ancient world ; and the disciples proceed, more or less deliberately, to prepare a history of their Master that would square with both Hebrew writings and heathen ideas."

(2) The *Historical* Objection.—And first of all, " the formation of the Christian Church is a great fact in history." Now the Church, according to the New Testament accounts, came into existence as the immediate consequence of the Resurrection of Christ.

[1] P. 720.

And this Resurrection is placed before us, not as an isolated fact, but rather, "as the culminating point of a series of powerful manifestations attributed to the personality of Christ."

At the same time we are told that the Crucifixion, just before it, was "the fiasco of all their hopes." And "the wonderful rally of their spirits is attributed to the fact that they were convinced of having seen Christ after he had been laid in the grave."

How would Prof. Cheyne meet these historic facts? And, further, there is absolutely no evidence to show that any of the Jews of that day "expressed a belief that the Messiah's reign of glory was only to be realized after his death." Such an idea evidently never entered into the heads of either the disciples, or the antagonistic Jews, or Gentile converts.

Thus the theory is at variance with the history of the Messianic idea presented by the pre-Christian Apocalyptic writings of the Jews, and the whole trend of popular religious thought at the time of Christ.

(3) *The Parallel with the Sun-Myth.*—The question at issue here is, "Does this part of the Gospel story betray a clear dependence on the myths of antiquity, or does it not?" To answer this question intelligently, we must glance at the myths referred to.

"The legend of Marduk's death and subsequent revival is *inferred* from the fact that his grave is reported to have been shown in Babylonia.[1] No actual account of what happened has so far come down to us."

Probably, however, Marduk, representing the spring sun, is the revived sun-god Dumuzi (Tammuz). Dumuzi was killed by a boar, and Istar made her descent to Hades to rescue her lover. Osiris too has been identified with the Babylonian Asari (= Marduk), and is the hero of "the most elaborate Resurrection legend of ancient

[1] Zimmern, *Kellinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 3rd Ed., p. 371.

times." He was killed by his brother Set, and the fragments of his body were found by Isis his 'sister-wife,' who put them together, and by means of magical rites gave him a renewed and perpetual existence.

Adonis also is a variant of the same story. He was also killed by a boar and is "year by year revived afresh by the incantations of his worshippers."

These, therefore, are the chief forms of a widespread myth "with which we asked to compare the Gospel accounts of the Resurrection."

"Now," says Mr Margoliouth," "it is on the face of it clear, that neither the facts narrated in the New Testament, nor the literary form of the narratives suggest a dependence on these ancient myths. The idea of life rising out of death, which was very early connected with the career of the sun, is indeed—as might be expected—at least as conspicuous in the early Christian records as elsewhere. But in order to be persuaded that the disciples, who, with such wonderful power of personal conviction, are reported to have founded the Christian Church, merely reproduced an ancient myth, which had somehow found its way into pre-Christian Jewish writings supposed to have once existed, we ought to have the strongest possible literary evidence in confirmation of the theory that the narratives of the Resurrection are borrowed from, or at any rate very highly coloured by, the legends of Dumuzi and Istar, Osiris and Isis, Adonis and Aphrodite. We have on the one hand the foundation of the Church, which can only be properly explained by the reality of the disciples' belief in the Resurrection. Psychological science supports the same view of things, and we have besides the evidence of five or six independent literary witnesses, testifying to the substantial truth of the same series of reported facts. In face of such an array of evidence, it ought to be quite conclusively demonstrated on the other side, that the parallel between the narratives of Christ's Resurrection,

and the various forms of the solar myth, is complete, or all but complete.

" But no such parallel has been shown to exist; and we are, therefore, bound to reject the new mythical theory, however great the personal authority of the writer who has proposed it to us."

The theory, indeed, is most inconclusive. We are not really told *how* this identity of Jesus with the old sun-myth came about. It was ' in the Jewish consciousness ' ! But, if so, how came Jesus to be looked upon as its concrete and actual realization ? As a matter of fact He was not; for the Jewish consciousness emphatically rejected Him as an impostor; and His final acceptance was by non-Semitic races, who were attracted largely by the beauty and simplicity as well as the power of His life and teaching.

APPENDIX D

JEWISH DOCTRINE CONCERNING THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD, AND THE TEACHING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

ACCORDING to ancient Jewish ideas, the immaterial portion of man[1] went shortly after death to *Sheôl*.[2] This place, like the Greek *Hades*, was conceived of as an underground world, generally approached through a mountainous cavern, or hole in the earth (1 Sam. xxvii.). It was a joyless land of shadows, and banishment from the presence of God; a place whence none returned or escaped.

But in the third century B.C. we find a change coming over the general conceptions of the future life. Sheôl is only an intermediate state, at all events for the righteous (2 Macc. vii. 9, 11, 14, 36, 37; Enoch li.). Then, along with the idea of future rewards and punishments, comes that of retribution in Sheôl itself, and a separation of righteous from wicked (Enoch li.). The view now is that only the righteous are set free; the wicked remain there for ever (Enoch lxiii. 8-10; xcix. 11). This prepares the way for the ultimate identification of Sheôl with Gehenna (cp. Mark ix. 44,

[1] The Heb. words for 'soul' (*nephesh*), and 'spirit' (*ruăch*) seem not to refer to two distinct parts of man; but only to two aspects (? human and divine) of the same inner and unseen life. Hence, the Old Testament does not directly and explicitly teach the doctrine of *three* divisions in man —'body' (σῶμα), 'soul' (ψυχή), and 'spirit' (πνεῦμα). This is only explicitly stated in the New Testament. (See Schmiedel and Von Soden on 1 Thess. v. 23, and Heb. iv. 12.) Cp. Kautzsch in Hastings, v.

[2] Assyr. *Sualu*, conceived as an underground city with seven walls and seven gates.

46, 48), which we find later on, especially in the Talmud.

This liberation of the righteous from Sheôl (2 Macc. xii. 43-45), takes the form of the hope of a resurrection of the original man; for, to be really *complete*, man must have his old body again,[1] or a similar one. Still there was not unanimity on this point. Even in the time of our Lord, the Sadducees and the Samaritans clung to the older views, and denied a resurrection altogether. The former indeed would seem to have adopted purely materialistic views. And even those who accepted the resurrection were much divided in opinions (cp. Mark ix. 10). Josephus says (*B. J.* ii. 8, 14), that the Pharisees of his time believed in a transmigration of souls,[2] which they identified with the resurrection of the dead (cp. Mark vi. 14). The Essenes, while believing in the immortality of the soul, denied the resurrection of the body.

Our Lord's teaching upon the subject of the Resurrection has been examined by Dr Fries in a paper[3] read at the Congress of the History of Religions, held in Paris, Sept. 1900. His teaching, he thinks, differed considerably from the current popular views. One of these was expressed by Martha of Bethany (John xi. 24); this (he thinks) is inconsistent with the statement of Jesus in vers. 25, 26. The latter verse merely affirms that, in the coming Messianic kingdom on earth, bodily death will be abolished in the case of all believers. With regard to those who have died previously, they too, in some way, are still to live on, in spite of death. But this—he continues—implies not such a resurrection as Martha looked for, but that Jesus identified 'life' and 'resurrection.' The καί in ἐγώ εἰμι ἡ ἀνάστασις καὶ ἡ ζωή

[1] This was also the popular idea of the ancient Egyptians.

[2] Probably derived from Greek sources, *e.g.* teaching of Pythagoras. See Zeller, *Pre-Socratic Philosophy* (Metempsychosis), vol. i. pp. 481-486.

[3] Pub. in the *Zeitschr. f. N. T. Wissenschaft*, 1900, Heft 4.

('I am the resurrection and (= even) the life') would be that of *identification*, or explanation, a sense which can be more easily accepted if we assume that Jesus spoke in Aramaic, and not in Greek. Hence, Fries rejects the words attributed to Jesus in John vi. 39 f., 44, 54 as glosses.

Next, considering Mark xii. 18-27, he argues that it would have been impossible for Jesus to draw from Exod. iii. 6, 16, any such inference as that implied in Martha's words. He explains this latter passage on the supposition that for Jesus the idea of resurrection from the dead is identical with that of eternal life with God, upon which the righteous enter immediately after death. In accordance with these presuppositions, Fries explains away the risings from the dead which are mentioned in the New Testament. Jaïrus's daughter, *e.g.*, was not really dead; so also Lazarus and Eutychus. The widow's son at Nain is not evidenced by eye-witnesses.

As regards our Lord's Resurrection, he believes that Jesus predicted it. The idea of the *third* day originated in the fact of the sepulchre having been found empty then.

The closest New Testament analogy to the teaching of Jesus, Fries finds in St Paul's fully developed doctrine in Phil. i. 21 ff.; iii. 11, which is reached after the stages described in 1 Thess. iv. 13 ff.; 1 Cor. xv. 35 ff.; 2 Cor. iv. 16-v. 10.

The results obtained in the above analysis are, however, to some extent questionable, and depend largely upon an arbitarary treatment of the text of the Fourth Gospel. The reply of Jesus to Martha (John xi. 25, 26) may be understood to mean that by virtue of His Messianic power, the disembodied spirits of the righteous will hereafter have a restored body; and this same restored life of spirit and body will then be eternal, and be no more subject (as now) to death of part.

What will happen to those who are alive at the inauguration of this new order of things is not here stated; but we may, perhaps, supply it from the subsequent teaching of St Paul: their bodies, instead of decaying, will be *changed*. The present *psychical* body, St Paul says, will become a *pneumatical* body, a body, that is, which in *form* and *appearance* will be identical with the old one, and recognizable as such, but possessed of new powers and capacities, and no longer hampered by the old conditions and limitations. And, further, this change—a *palingenesis* of a body, in the case of those already dead, and a *metamorphosis* in the case of those still alive—will take place "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the last trump," whatever may be meant by this obviously symbolical statement.

It is impossible, indeed, to explain away, as some would do, the New Testament references to a future bodily-spiritual life of some kind. Also, the *identity* is not that of the life and the resurrection, but of the *individual*, who is the *same person*, both apparently and in reality, but existing upon some higher plane under totally different conditions.

For further information on this subject, the reader is referred to *Eschatology, Hebrew, Jewish and Christian*, by R. H. Charles, D.D., which throws a flood of light on many points of interest in the fully developed Pauline doctrine of a future life.

INDEX

Acts, authorship of, 72
—— of Paul, 72
—— of Pilate, 174
Adonis, 207
Allen, W., on missing end of Mark, 156
Ananias and Paul, 69, 75
Andrew, 68
Angelic command at tomb, 13
Annas, 178
Announcement of angels, 10
Anointing body of Jesus, 3
Anti-Docetism at Jerusalem, 115
Apostles, views of, concerning Resurrection, 129
—— antipathy of, to magic, 146
Apostolic list of appearances, 92
Apparition theory, 188
Appearances, early Christian ideas of, 39
—— in Galilee, 114
—— in Jerusalem, 117
—— nature of, 22, 47
Arabia, journey of Paul to, 72, 76
Asari (=Marduk), 201
Ascension of Isaiah, 126
—— of Jesus, the, 25, 50, 59
Astral body, 188
Auditory hallucinations, 132, 135

Bahrdt, 183
Baur and vision of Paul, 85
Bavarian Passion Play, 194
Blair, J. F., and delivery of women's message, 14
Broun, summary of German criticism, 165
Bunsen, 183

Caiaphas, 178, 193
Cephas, 37
Charles, R. H., 173, 212
Cheyne, T. K., 200
Cleopas (Clopas), 37
Codex Bezæ, 1
Collective hallucinations, 29, 136
Conder, Colonel, on Emmaus, 36
Conspiracy theory, 192
Coptic narrrative and appearance to women, 19
1 Cor. xv. 5 (date of evidence in), 95
Corinthians, scepticism of, 91, 103
Crookes, Sir W., 159
Crowell, E., 189

Dæmons, 173
Damascus, journey of Paul from, 71, 76
Delivery of message by women, 13
De Wette on Resurrection of Jesus, 167
Denial of existence of Jesus, 128
Diatessaron and appearance to women, 19
Didascalia and appearance to women, 19
Dillman, 99
Disciples fled to Galilee, 13, 31, 60
—— and Messiahship of Jesus, 30
Discrepancies between Acts and Pauline Epistles, 70
Docetic views regarding Jesus, 39
Dumuzi, 206

Early Christians and the appearances of Jesus, 40
Earthquake at tomb, 8
Eleven, appearances to, 45
Emmaus, 36, 188, 196
Empty tomb, 13, 92, 97, 101, 198
Enoch, Book of, 129
Ephræm the Syrian and women at sepulchre, 19
Epilepsy and vision of Paul, 81
Ἔρχεται, meaning of, 3

Essenes, 183
Eucharist, Jesus present in, 40
Evidence, rules as applied to narratives, 161
—— of women, 102
Examination of tomb, 109
Ezekiel xlvii. 8, 121

Fichte, 186, 190
Five hundred, appearance to, 57
—— —— and Pentecost, 94
Flight of disciples to Galilee, 13, 31, 67, 116
Fragmentary character of narratives, 11
Fraud, theories of, 191
Fries, S. A., 210

Galilean appearances (*see* Galilee, tradition of)
Galilee, 56, 62, 114, 121
—— tradition of, 20, 29, 126
—— spiritual visions of, 115
Gehenna, 209
Γνωρίζω, meaning of, 83
Gnostic views regarding Jesus, 39
Georgian translation of an Apocryphal Resurrection Narrative, 178
Gibson, M. D., 168
Greek difficulties with Resurrection, 89
—— views of Hades, 89
Guard at tomb, 2, 179
—— appearance to, 170

Hades, 89, 209
Hallucinatory view of appearances, 131
Hardouin and identity of Cephas, 37
Harmonies, futility of, 10
Harmony of narratives, 9, 122
Harnack, view of John xxi., 156
—— on belief of disciples in Resurrection, 163, 169
—— on Acts, 72
Hebrew for 'soul' and 'spirit,' 209
Hebrews, Gospel according to, 32, 35, 36, 172, 182
Hilgenfeld, 182
Holtzmann, 186
Holy Spirit, bestowal of, 54

Ignatius ad. Smyrn., 173
Illustrations of subjective and objective visions, 137
Instructions to women, 11
Interval between Resurrection and Ascension, 125
Istar, 206

James, appearance to, 32
—— son of Alphæus, 37
Jerusalem, journey of Paul to, 76
—— tradition of, 20, 29, 126
Jewish conception of Resurrection, 89
—— doctrine of Resurrection, development of, 209
—— views of post-mortem state, 180, 209
Joanna, 7
John xxi., 63
Joseph of Arimathea, 1, 174, 193
Josephus on Emmaus, 36, 210
Justin Martyr, 191

Keim on vision theory, 187
Keim's summary of theory of Paulus, 184
—— theory of objective vision, 136
Kitchener, Lord, 197

Lactantius, 112
Lake, K., on Emmaus story, 39
—— on John xxi., 156
Latin versions and appearances at Emmaus, 38
Lazarus, 99, 211
Le Bon on matter, 48
Levi, 68, 168, 172
Λῆρος, 13
List of appearances, comparative, 86
Logomachies, 83
Loman, 128
Lombroso, C., 159
Loofs, theory of, 118
Lovejoy on Ascension, 59
Luke xxiv. 12, 5

Magic, ancient and modern, 145
Mahdi, 197
Malchus, 34, 172
Maimonides, 97
Mamileh, Mount, 175
Marduk, 201
Margoliouth, G. (in *Contemporary Review*), 203
Mark's Gospel, missing end, 13, 52, 156
Martha of Bethany, 210
Martineau, J., and vision theory, 185
Martyrdom of Isaiah, 173
Mary Magdalene, appearance to, 18
Materialistic theory of Resurrection, 105
Materialization, 145
Matter, nature of, 48
Matthew xxviii. 9-10, 112
Maxwell, J., 159
μένειν and *καθίζειν*, 123
Menke on Emmaus, 36
Mesmerism, 158
Message, delivery of, by women, 13, 105
Messianic kingdom, 210
Metempsychosis, theory of, 210
Meyer on vision of Paul, 79
Midrash of Rabbins, 66
Miracles, nature of, 46, 149
Moon god, 200
Moon, three days invisible, 200
Moses and Apollonius, 183
Mount of Olives and Galilee, 121
Myers, F. W. H., and hallucinations, 138
Mythological theory, 199

Narratives, general agreement of, 163
Natural and spiritual body, 104
Nature of appearances, 22, 47, 128, 141
Neander, 167
Nicholson, E. B., 33, 172
Nicodemus, 1, 178
Non-identification of Jesus, 21, 37

Objective visions, 29, 185
Olives, Mount, 183
Ophites and Ascension, 125
Ὀψὲ σαββάτων, 5
Oriental history and biography, 36
Origen on two disciples at Emmaus, 37
—— on the Resurrection, 142, 185, 193
Orr, J., on visional and apparitional theories, 140
Osiris, 201
Οὐκ οἴδαμεν, 4

Paley's evidences, 192
Parousia, the, 64
Paul, St, and the empty tomb, 92
—— difficulties with the Resurrection, 89, 104, 212
—— list of appearances, 35, 86, 91, 94
—— list of *credenda*, 101
—— on the glorified body, 22
—— view of Resurrection, 89, 104, 212
—— vision of, 69, 81
—— visit to Jerusalem, 77
—— words heard by, 73
Paulus, 183, 186
Percept, stages in development of, 151
Peshitta version and Emmaus story, 38
Peter, appearances to, 27, 37, 68
—— Gospel according to, 16, 67, 127, 168, 169, 179, 182
—— rehabilitation of, 65
—— situation of, 78
Petronius (centurion), 169
Pfleiderer, O., and vision of Paul, 81
Phantasmal nature of appearances, 39
Phenomena observed at appearances, Jesus eating, 51
—— speaking, 22, 45, 47, 52, 73
—— passing through matter, 51
Pilate, 182
Pistis Sophia, 126
Pleiades, forty days invisible, 201
Plummer, A., on Emmaus story, 44
Prætorian will, 170
Predictions of Jesus, 28, 29, 98, 120
Priest's servant, appearance to, 33

Protestant criticism of New Testament in Germany, 164
Psychical research, modern, 159
Psychology, Christian scheme of, 153, 212

Ramsay, Sir W., on accuracy of Luke, 157
Reformation ideas of Scripture, 162
Reimarus on discrepancies in Narratives, 160, 191
Renan and appearance to Mary Magdalene, 10, 20, 41
—— and swoon theory, 185, 187
Resch, theory of, 121
Rest of the words of Baruch, 99
Resurrection, general, 104
—— of spirit, theory of, 143
Revelations, Paul on, 134
Revivification, theory of, 142
Robertson, J. M., 128, 200
Robinson, J. A., 169
Rolleston, T. W., 197
Roman interference, theory of, 197

Salome, 7
Scene of first appearances, 111
Schmiedel, explanation of John xxi., 66
—— explanation of Paul's vision, 78
—— identity of Holy Spirit and Christ, 19
—— on origin of Emmaus story, 39
—— on subjective nature of appearances, 128
—— objections to story of empty tomb, 101
Schleiermacher, 183, 186
Schmidt, 169
Séance, modern, 145
Septuagint and Galilee, 121
Serapion, 168
Set, 207
Seven, appearance to, 60
Seydel, 190
Sheôl, 180, 209
Sibylline oracles, 97
Silence of women, 14, 114
Solar deities, 201
Sons of Zebedee, 63
Sources of story of visit to tomb, 7
Spear wound, 52
Spices, purchase of, 7
Spinoza and vision theory, 185, 189
Spiritual body, theory of, 147
Spiritualists and the Resurrection, 145
Statements agreed upon by four narratives, 9
Steck, views of, 57, 83, 86, 94
Steinmayer on Paul, 85
Stone at tomb, 8
Strauss and the burial of Jesus, 97
—— and the vision theory, 185, 200
Sualu, 209
Subjective visions, 29, 131, 137
Sunstroke and the vision of Paul, 81
Supernatural, prejudice against, 164
—— religion, views of author of, 8, 21, 41, 45, 53, 183
Swete, H. B., 169
Swoon theory, 53, 183
Syr. Cur. and Emmaus story, 38
—— Sin. and Emmaus story, 38

Tactual hallucinations, 132
Tammuz, 206
τῇ ἐπιφωσκούσῃ, κ.τ.λ., 6
Telegram theory (Keim), 189
Tertullian, 112, 142, 191
Testament of Hezekiah, 173
Texts in Old Testament bearing on Resurrection, 99
Theft of body of Jesus, 102, 109, 159, 191
Third day, meaning of, 100
Thomas and the appearances of Jesus, 52
Three as a sacred number, 61
—— days, the, Winckler on, 200
Tiberius, 199
Time of sojourn of Jesus in tomb, 100
—— of women's visit to tomb, 5
Tradition of Galilee, 20, 29, 126
—— of Jerusalem, 20, 126

Tripartite theory of man's constitution, 105
Two disciples, appearance to, 36

Unseen universe, 59

Valentinians and Ascension, 125
Van Manen on Acts, 72
—— on Pauline Epistles, 87
Vedânta, teaching of, 40
Venturini, 183, 186
Vicarious sacrifice, 88
Vickers, J., 192
Vision (objective) theory, 185
Visions, Paul's use of term, 134
Visual hallucinations, 131
Volkmar and burial of Jesus, 97
Voysey, C., 183

Watch at sepulchre, 2, 179
Weiss, theory of, 120, 185
Weisse, 186, 190
Weizsäcker on belief of disciples, 163, 186
Westcott and Hort, 113
Wettstein and Jewish belief about spirits of dead, 99
Wieseler and the two disciples at Emmaus, 37
Winckler, 200
Witness of the Twelve, the, 93
Wolfenbüttel fragments, 160
Women at the tomb, 2, 31, 86
Words of Jesus, references to, 131

Zahn, Th., 169
Zeller, E., 173
Zeus, grave of, 200
Zimmern, 200
Zschokke on Emmaus, 36

52106 232.5Q
T393